

PAROCHIAL  
SELF-GOVERNMENT

HENRY C. STEPHENS, M.P.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
AT LOS ANGELES



EX LIBRIS

*Rusk*

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

<http://www.archive.org/details/parochialselfgov00step>

AMERICAN CLASSIC  
2013 SEMI-SWEET CHOCOLATE  
TRUFFLES

*Local Government*

# Parochial Self-Government in Rural Districts.

---

## ARGUMENT AND PLAN.

---

BY

HENRY C. STEPHENS, M.P.

---

SPECIAL ISSUE.

---

LONDON:  
LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.,  
AND NEW YORK: 15, EAST 16TH STREET.

1893.

*All Rights Reserved.*

COPYRIGHT.

1893.

BY

HENRY C. STEPHENS, M.P.

---

*First Edition, Royal 4to, 12/6.*

*Second Edition, Crown 8vo, 1/-*

*Special Issue, for Presentation only.*

11/6/41 ave

P 1  
83

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

---

LIBRARY SETS  
THIS edition of the Author's treatise on Parochial Self-Government has been published in compliance with the suggestion made by most of the reviewers of the first edition—that the work should be issued in a cheaper and more convenient form.

DEC 1 5 1940

HARDING  
In fact, however, there is no resemblance at all between the two Bills. Their principles and machinery are as distinct from and as strange to one another as the Equator and the Poles.

686320

The Author's object is to refer, for as many purposes as practicable, the action required upon parish affairs in rural parishes to the general body of the inhabitants, who are the individuals personally affected, and are in contact with and have under their eyes the facts upon which action has to be taken. The machinery proposed by the Author's Bill practically amounts to a restoration of the old liberty of and powers for administration possessed by the inhabitants in vestry assembled. In those popular assemblies personal rights and property interests balanced their claims if they were found to clash, and, with free discussion and common consent founded upon it, the inhabitants, for at least a century and a half, carried on their parish business with striking and quite incontestable success. Nor did any indications of decay appear until, through the effects of centralizing aggressions, all parochial independence had been gradually extinguished.

On the other hand, the "Bill for Local Government in England and Wales," introduced by the Government, is conceived in a totally different spirit and unfolds an apparently op-

posite intention to that of the Author. It deprives the Parish of important and responsible powers, and confers none which are not trivial in value or in extent. The effective powers for direct parish management, now possessed collectively by the inhabitants, and the understanding and personal guard of their interests which they obtain from direct management would disappear. As the Bill stands the inhabitants would be forced to transfer their powers for direct management to a very few elected persons, called a Parish Council.

Under such rule the mind and information of the inhabitants as a body cannot be utilized for local welfare. The Parish Council, if elected as proposed for a long *fixed term*, would be lifted beyond the reach of the inhabitants, whose influence upon it could only be occasional and dubious, while on the other hand, a control over parish affairs of an overwhelming character and immediate and continuous in its action, would, under the Bill, be acquired by centralized authorities.

Parish Councils so constituted would not confer authority upon the inhabitants, but would

really withdraw it from them, at the same time providing a veil for concealing the advance of centralizing methods into Local Government. It is a change of this description which appears to be contemplated by the Government measure.

If the Bill should be passed upon its present basis, it will certainly disappoint the existing expectations of relief and reform. On the one side, the centralization it introduces is of a kind which, far from relieving, must increase the load upon Parliament, and on the other its irritating and wasteful meddling at the root of local administration must weaken instead of developing local faculty.

*September, 1893.*

## P R E F A C E.

FOR some years past the Author has worked at the proposal for establishing rural self-government which is embodied in the following pages. He has been impelled to do so from a strong conviction that very great advantages in the past have been, and in the future might be, obtained from the administration of local affairs upon a system which would at once inform the mind, and engage the responsibility, of ratepayers through their practical participation in the work of local management.

A careful study of Poor Law Administration from its commencement to our own day shows how self-government, when confined to areas within which it had the effective understanding conferred by the sight of local facts, achieved most striking successes, while the centralized administration which superseded Parish Management, being dependent upon Report, could not acquire the intimate complete and living knowledge necessary to make its action safe, and thus drifted into a corruption and wastefulness threatening national bankruptcy.

A desire to afford a clear explanation has prompted the Author to present his suggestions for Parish Government in the form of a Bill. The errors and omissions in such a Bill must of necessity be very numerous, but, notwithstanding these inevitable shortcomings this mode of treatment is preferable for clearness of explanation, to methods of a more abstract character in which terms of merely general description are employed.

The Author may at once anticipate some criticism by admitting that he is quite aware of the tolerably obvious risks connected with this mode of handling so large a subject. He is also conscious of having no plea to excuse his presumption, beyond the qualification of much practical experience, gathered from unofficial service over a long period of time in nearly every branch of local administration.

# INDEX.

---



---

|   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION . . . . . | iii. |
| PREFACE . . . . .                       | vii. |
| INDEX . . . . .                         | ix   |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . .             | xii. |

## *PART I.*

### THE PRESENT POSITION AND ITS DIFFICULTIES.

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Chapter I. CAUSES OF EXTRAVAGANCE, AND MISMANAGEMENT AMONG LOCAL AUTHORITIES WITH LARGE AREAS . . . . . | 1  |
| ,, II. THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROPOSALS OF 1888 . . . . .   | 6  |
| ,, III. THE EXISTING BOARDS OF GUARDIANS AND THE PROPOSED RURAL DISTRICT COUNCILS . . . . .             | 9  |
| ,, IV. THE PARISH AS THE LOCAL UNIT . . . . .   | 15 |
| ,, V. THE PARISH AND RURAL DEPOPULATION   | 19 |
| ,, VI. THE PARISH AND COMPOUNDING FOR RATES   | 23 |
| ,, VII. THE PARISH AND DIVISION OF DUTIES .   | 27 |
| ,, VIII. THE DECEPTION BELONGING TO PARISH COUNCILS . . . . .   | 28 |

*PART II.*

CONCERNING DEPARTMENTS OF LOCAL  
MANAGEMENT.

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Chapter I. THE PARISH AND POOR RELIEF—   |      |
| Division 1. THE EXISTING ASSUMPTIONS<br>ARE BASELESS . . . . .                                     | 36   |
| ,, 2. CENTRALIZING AGGRESSIONS<br>CAUSED THE BREAKDOWN<br>OF POOR RELIEF MANAGE-<br>MENT . . . . . | 43   |
| ,, 3. THE CENTRALIZED MANA-<br>GEMENT AT WORK . . . . .  | 62   |
| ,, 4. THE PATH TO TRUE REFORM  | 78   |
| ,, 5. OLD AGE PENSIONS . . . . .   | 83   |
| ,, II. THE PARISH AND PUBLIC HEALTH . . . . .  | 91   |
| ,, III. THE PARISH AND HIGHWAYS . . . . .  | 96   |
| ,, IV. THE PARISH AND EDUCATION . . . . .  | 99   |
| ,, V. THE PARISH AND CHARITY PROPERTY . . . . .  | 105  |
| ,, VI. THE PARISH AND ALLOTMENTS. . . . .  | 108  |

*PART III.*

## WHAT IS WANTED.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| THE OBJECTS TO BE SECURED BY A PARISH GOVERN-<br>MENT BILL . . . . . | 116 |
| Division 1. ONE RATING AUTHORITY . . . . .                           | 116 |
| ,, 2. ONE AREA . . . . .   | 121 |

---

|  | PAGE. |
|--|-------|
| Division 3. DIRECT SELF-MANAGEMENT BY THE RATE-PAYERS . . . . .  | 122   |
| ,, 4. DECENTRALIZATION BY THE AGENCY OF COUNTY COUNCILS. . . . . | 127   |

*PART IV.*

A SYSTEM OF  
COMPLETE LOCAL SELF-MANAGEMENT  
ESTABLISHING  
ONE RATING AUTHORITY AND ONE AREA ONLY  
UNDER THE COUNTY.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Division 1. A GENERAL VIEW OF THE PARISH GOVERNMENT BILL . . . . .     | 133 |
| ,, 2. SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS UNDER THE PARISH GOVERNMENT BILL . . . . . | 135 |
| ,, 3. DRAFT OF THE PARISH GOVERNMENT BILL                              | 139 |

*PART V.*

APPENDIX OF FINCHLEY VESTRY MINUTES, WITH TABLE SHEWING ASSESSMENTS, RATES, AND MEETINGS FROM 1780 TO 1841 . . 157

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Division 1. VESTRY MINUTES OF FINCHLEY, FROM EASTER, 1769, TO EASTER, 1770 . . . . . | 163 |
| ,, 2. VESTRY MINUTES OF FINCHLEY, FROM EASTER, 1798, TO EASTER, 1799 . . . . .       | 174 |
| ,, 3. VESTRY MINUTES OF FINCHLEY, FROM EASTER, 1825, TO EASTER, 1826 . . . . .       | 216 |
| ,, 4. VESTRY MINUTES OF FINCHLEY, FROM EASTER, 1839, TO EASTER, 1840 . . . . .       | 258 |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

---

### P A R T I.

---

#### THE PRESENT POSITION AND ITS DIFFICULTIES.

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Chapter I.—Causes of extravagance and mismanagement among Local Authorities with large Areas . . . .</i> | <i>Page 1</i> |
|---|---------------|

The ratepayers apathetic and indifferent, and why—Continuous drifting to a bureaucratic system for centralized control—Large Local Authorities not in touch with their practical work—Large local areas a cause of degeneration in local administration—The multiplication of Committees compels blind decisions—Large local areas render administration too exclusively official—Necessity for keeping separately in view the true functions of small and large local authorities.

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| <i>Chapter II.—The Local Government Proposals of 1888. . . .</i> | <i>Page 6.</i> |
|--|----------------|

Overwhelming details of Local Government Bill of 1888—The entanglement of areas—The extravagance from authorities spending, rating and borrowing independently—The helpless position of ratepayers—These reforms not attempted, but remaining powers of parish extinguished—Rapid legislation assists departments in keeping and acquiring power—Below County Councils the Bill would have imposed centralization—*First*, by subjecting inhabitants to Local Authority—*Second*, by subjecting Local Authority to Central Departments.

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| <i>Chapter III.—The existing Boards of Guardians and the Proposed Rural District Councils .. . .</i> | <i>Page 9.</i> |
|--|----------------|

The existing Boards of Guardians—The spirit of local self-government broken down—Table of Parishes as distributed among Unions—Union Boards too bulky to manage parishes—Daytime meetings and distant meeting-places prevent desirable persons from becoming Union Guardians—Rural District Councils practically identical with Boards of Guardians, and both useless for local self-government.—Would have reduced the influence of inhabitants to vanishing point.

*Chapter IV.—The Parish as the Local Unit . . Page 15.*

In old countries new local areas cannot be imposed by central authority—Secular parishes go back beyond record as units of local self-government—Traditional and general customs rooted in parish, hence its persistent vitality—Table of population of Parishes—No valid reason for objecting to small parishes—Parish Committees acted during consent.

*Chapter V.—The Parish and Rural Depopulation . . Page 19.*

Dangers of rural depopulation—Perverse deportation of local business makes country life *dull*, but this dulness powers for sound self-government would sweep away—Parish self-government would give to agricultural labourers real opportunity for general improvement—Cultivation in small holdings would arrest rural depopulation, but parish institutions are required.

*Chapter VI.—The Parish and Compounding for Rates.  
Page 23.*

Legislation on rate compounding—Compounding lowers self-respect, and destroys parochial order and equality—Evidence of Poor Law Commissioners—By compounding poor save nothing, local authorities lose, and owner pockets an allowance he does not earn—Natural instincts for economy among poorer ratepayers may be depended upon—Parish Government Bill offers safeguards.

*Chapter VII.—The Parish and Division of Duties. Page 27.*  
Better administration obtained by dividing parish duties—Willingness to come forward becomes greater, as parish duties are fairly apportioned.*Chapter VIII.—The Deception belonging to Parish Councils.  
Page 28.*

Parish Councils upon urban basis completely unsuitable for rural parishes—Modern machinery offers to ratepayers a **VOTE-FIGHT**, but nothing else, whereas self-management in parishes rarely requires election voting—Method of vestry was **COMMON CONSENT** by **COMMON KNOWLEDGE** out of **OPEN DISCUSSION**—Local Management now arbitrarily conducted, and ratepayers excluded from knowledge and control—Old open parish meetings gave inhabitants knowledge of one another, whereas present system stimulates electioneering manœuvring, but keeps inhabitants ignorant of one another—Ratepayers' associations are anomalous, but pathetic protest, against *long fixed term*—To make local managers *irremovable for fixed periods* would be disastrous innovation, inexcusable in rural parishes—*Irremovable fixed periods* leave ratepayers with no power to protect themselves, and in state of injurious irritation against local authority—Continuity of management would be **REALLY PROMOTED BY NOT ELECTING FOR A FIXED**

**TERM—IRREMOVABLE FOR FIXED-PERIOD PARISH COUNCILS** would displace open deliberation by secrecy and intrigue—Irremovable-for-fixed-period Parish Council would create petty tyranny in parish, and provide effective implement for carrying out extreme centralization.

---

## PART II.

---

### CONCERNING DEPARTMENTS OF LOCAL MANAGEMENT.

#### *Chapter I.—The Parish and Poor Relief.*

##### **DIVISION 1.—THE EXISTING ASSUMPTIONS ARE BASELESS.**

*Page 36.*

Independent parish management of poor has been the most successful—Central departments instinctively labour against decentralization of control—Charge against vestry management of poor is flatly opposed to facts—Parish administration gave promise of extirpating pauperism—43rd Elizabeth and New Poor Law of 1834 compared—State of country immediately before passing 43rd Elizabeth—Charge for poor did not increase under management by parishes—Important judicial opinion in 1790, preferring small districts on ground of their better provision for poor—Individual care required to cure pauperism.

##### **DIVISION 2.—CENTRALIZING AGGRESSIONS CAUSED THE BREAKDOWN OF POOR RELIEF MANAGEMENT.**

*Page 43*

By 43rd Elizabeth provision for poor made in parish church upon Sunday after divine service—13th and 14th Car. II. Chap. 12 throws light upon actual working—3rd Will. and Mary Chap. 11 prescribed that *inhabitants should meet as often as convenient* to consider and give relief—Power given to a justice irrelevant and probably unintentional—Poor Law Commissioners in quotation omit words “*or as often as it shall be thought convenient,*” a power essential to working of 3rd and 4th Will. and Mary—Evidence of Poor Law Commissioners affirms that parish management under utmost decentralization gave 100 years of successful administration—8th and 9th Will. III. Chap. 30—For 110 years legislature never intervened except to enlarge control of inhabitants—The Act of 9 Geo. I., though passed to remedy mischiefs arising from power given to justices, and intended to increase parish powers, unintentionally became first step towards disorganization and overthrow of parochial self-government—How destructive degradation of parish responsibility and management brought about—Power of arbitrary interference conferred upon justices caused respectable persons to cease attending vestries and to avoid office of Overseer—Vestries and overseers thwarted in their plans by inconsiderate interference of justices—Provisions 9th Geo. I. spread very slowly among parishes—with independence and full responsibility, *open vestries* conducted parish

affairs with thoroughness, order and economy—During 150 years from 43rd Elizabeth, independent parish management had “*nearly exterminated pauperism*,” thereafter centralization by successive legislative steps suppressed independent parish management—22 Geo. III., endeavour to squeeze out all parish control and independence by close centralization—33 Geo. III. presents centralization proceeding by its normal method of degrading unpaid local service—33 Geo. III. took from parishes power to impose workhouse test, and gave power to magistrates to order relief as they thought fit—By 1796 vestries had ceased to have any responsibility for poor relief—Overseers liable to punishment by magistrates, were induced to behave treacherously to the inhabitants—In 1801 “*magistrate-appointed*” guardians allowed to force taxation, and to spend and borrow money without consent of inhabitants—50 Geo. III. Chap. 49 transferred audit of overseers’ accounts from inhabitants to magistrates—50 Geo. III. Chap. 50 gave power to force parishes into spider’s webb of 22 Geo. III.—Act 55 Geo. III. gave magistrates power to order relief for three or six months—59 Geo. III. Chap. 12 practically recognized that centralization was struggling with evils of its own creation—For more than 160 years direct parish management made rating low, whereas in 40 years centralization of poor relief management caused a crushing taxation.

**DIVISION 3.—THE CENTRALIZED MANAGEMENT AT WORK** ... ... ... ... *Page 62.*

Centralizing bias of 1834 report, shown by omission to refer to Gilbert’s Act, intended to stifle all parish independence—Centralization forced impossible duties upon magistrates—Overseers could only furnish magistrates with knowledge by report—“Allowance” system, “Roundsman” system, “Labour rate” system, “scales of relief” system, *devised by magistrates and imposed by them*—“Scales of relief” and “labour rate” devices set up in substitution for local responsibility—Breakdown of poor relief conclusively attributable to centralizing legislation—Centralization by displacing individual investigation in poor relief increased pauperism enormously—“Roundsman system,” “parish employment,” and other mechanical make shifts, as put in force by magistrates—Singular remarks by Commissioners apparently exhibiting bias—Disastrous consequences, attributable to centralized system, superseding parish control—Laxity of administration and scandal greatest from practice of stipendiary magistrates—At Cholesbury cost of maintaining poor exceeded whole yearly value of land—Flood of pauperism arrested by New Poor Law—For about 170 years out of 230, poor relief managed independently by parishes with low and decreasing expenditure; during next 60 years, as parochial administration gradually broken down, poor rate charges increased enormously.

**DIVISION 4.—THE PATH TO TRUE REFORM ..** *Page 78.*  
In rural parish there are conditions of “everybody knowing every-

body else," which provide knowledge for successful out-door relief—Finchley Vestry minutes exhibit method and particulars of direct management of poor relief by ratepayers in rural parish—In rural parish out-relief best as it is under constant sight. In union out-relief dangerous because beyond supervision—Poor Law orders for prohibition of out-door relief hopelessly struggle against candour and good sense—Parish offers most capable working and most strict accountability for management of poor relief, especially out-relief—Out-relief requires close abundant supervision of recipients at their own homes. Parish can provide it, but impossible for union to do so—"Test employment" is valuable safeguard which parish could freely and economically use, but union helpless about it, because too far away—Distant union administration encourages sporadic charity. Parish could organize all its charity for complete dealing with its pauperism and cure of it—County Council control standing between parishes and Local Government Board would improve both local management and national control—Parish Government Bill proposes arrangements for *indoor* and *outdoor* relief in conformity with different requirements for their administration.

**DIVISION 5.—OLD AGE PENSIONS .. . . . Page 88.**

"Old Age Pensions" would provide new and important bulwark against pauperism—Knowledge and faculty for adaptation to differing circumstances of locality and industry best provided by County Authority—Parishes recommend themselves for local agency from habit of agricultural poor to engage in co-operative assurance against livelihood risks—with poor relief on parish basis, parish fashion and discipline would powerfully support "Old Age Pensions"—County Council guarantee would be as effective as Imperial guarantee, and self-interested advocacy of parish agency better than Post Office.

**Chapter II.—The Parish and Public Health. .. . . . Page 91.**

Present Rural Sanitary Authorities are screens for centralized direction—One central authority "*all that can be requisite to secure complete local government*"—Arbitrary powers given in Sanitary Acts upon inducement of promises which have not been redeemed—Central authority by pretence of assistance has checked local effort—Public Health Act, 1875, sections 15 and 22, has caused waste of millions upon sewage disposal—Inspectorism, expertism, and officialism of "One Central Authority" have largely contributed to existing deadlock in sewage purification—Plan of "Parish Government Bill" gives sanitary powers to parishes, but supervision and control to County Councils.

**Chapter III.—The Parish and Highways. .. . . . Page 96.**

Two areas for highway management among rural parishes—Act of 1875, Highways Act, 1878, and Public Health Act, 1875, provide management by Parish Surveyor, Highway Board, District

---

Highway Board, or Rural Sanitary Authority—Highways under Local Government Act of 1888—Highways with parochial administration under county control—Scheme of Parish Government Bill.

*Chapter IV.—The Parish and Education. . . . Page 99*

Union Board useless as School Attendance Authority—Through want of time and unmanageable area—It cannot enquire, or administer, or attract, outside assistance—Parish has unrivalled qualifications for perfect discharge of school attendance duties—Larger amount of public money now given to schools makes management more of public trusteeship—One or more self appointed persons provide management inferior and injurious as compared with parish management—Parish management would place Education Department in far better position for control of every kind—Parish Education Committee acting during consent of inhabitants affords superior administration—Continuity of management better secured by allowing inhabitants constant influence than by *fixed-term* School Board—Scheme under Parish Government Bill.

*Chapter V.—The Parish and Charity Property. . . . Page 105*

Statutory enactments and Commissions of Inquiry issued before present century—Lord Brougham's and other Commissions of Inquiry leading to Charitable Trusts Act, 1853—Existing supervision and general powers of Charity Commissioners—Dissatisfaction caused by present management of charity funds would be avoided by direct parish administration under existing audit and control of Commissioners—Management of parish charities according to Parish Government Bill.

*Chapter VI.—The Parish and Allotments. . . . Page 108*

Union Boards useless for provision of allotments—Reasons for introducing so-called Appeal Act of 1890—Causes of failure in both 1887 and 1890 Acts the same—Large areas with their unavoidable centralization make machinery intricate and costly—Obvious course to give power where knowledge and interest lie, because precise appreciation of local facts is an absolute necessity—Parishes have the needed propulsive force—County Councils would beneficially exercise various powers of Court of Control over parishes—Reports of Poor Law Commissioners—Mr. Okeden—Mr. Majendie—Boards of Guardians and Standing Committees of County Councils too isolated and remote for management or for help—Scheme for allotments under Parish Government Bill.

## PART III.

## WHAT IS WANTED.

*The objects to be secured by a Parish Government Bill.*

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| DIVISION 1.—ONE RATING AUTHORITY .. .. .. ..   | Page 116. |
| Extravagance only preventible by placing expenditure and taxation under one responsibility—Powers over one purse independently exercised by different authorities must induce competitive expenditure—Local Government Board audit pretends much but can effect little—Is power to borrow up to two years possessed separately by each of, or collectively between, local authorities of a district? No reliable answer can be given—Consent of Local Government Board for borrowing a snare—True economy depends upon local knowledge of inhabitants—Instead of independent taxing and spending authorities, parish expenditure should be drawn to one focus, for forecast and regulation under Parish Budget—Parish to govern its expenditure and taxation, under control of County Council. |           |
| DIVISION 2.—ONE AREA .. .. .. ..   | Page 121. |
| To establish one area only under County—Parishes with existing powers to unite or sub-divide can furnish convenient areas for all local needs.   |           |
| DIVISION 3.—DIRECT SELF-MANAGEMENT BY THE RATEPAYERS .. .. .. ..   | Page 122. |
| Why should not ratepayers have direct control?—Why fear their direct management of local affairs?—Independent open vestry managed poor relief with extraordinary success—Local self-government <i>versus</i> centralization—Illustration of old basis of open vestry, its methods, meetings, and general work of local self-government—COMMON CONSENT marked feature of vestry action—Miserable substitution of “plebiscite” voting for direct practical powers—Parish Committees to act <i>during consent</i> of inhabitants.   |           |
| DIVISION 4.—DECENTRALIZATION BY THE AGENCY OF COUNTY COUNCILS .. .. .. ..  | Page 127  |
| If powers for self-management be given to parishes their County Councils must connect with them for supervision and control—Supervision by Local Government Board over thousands of parishes impracticable—Parliament now too overloaded to check official abuses in Departments of Central Government, though   |           |

such abuses cannot be otherwise repressed—County Council supervision would help development of parish administration—Local Government enquiry at present dissatisfying proceeding and full of needless secrecy—Contrast presented between hearing before Court of Law and hearing by Local Government Enquiry—County Councils could furnish capable and open Court for local enquiries—County Councils should not only decentralize control over parishes, but also assist towards necessary national control over general local administration.

---

---

## PART IV.

---

### A SYSTEM OF COMPLETE LOCAL SELF-MANAGEMENT ESTABLISHING ONE RATING AUTHORITY AND ONE AREA ONLY UNDER THE COUNTY.

---

DIVISION 1.—A GENERAL VIEW OF THE PARISH GOVERNMENT BILL .. . . . . *Page 133*

DIVISION 2.—SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS UNDER THE PARISH GOVERNMENT BILL .. . . . . *Page 135*

Incorporation of Parish—Meetings of ratepayers and voting—Of chairman of vestry and overseers—Parish Committee paymaster and tax collector—Parish officers—Committees for special purposes—Administration of Poor Laws—Execution of Public Health Acts and Burial Acts—Appeal to Local Government Board against action or default of County Council—Administration of Education Acts—Administration relating to Highways—Charitable Trusts Committee—Allotments Committee—Administration of various Acts—Payments, Accounts, and Audit.

DIVISION 3.—DRAFT OF THE PARISH GOVERNMENT BILL. *Page 139*

Short title—Interpretation of terms—Incorporation of Parish—Meetings of inhabitants in vestry—Meetings how to be called—Voting at meetings—Poll of parish—Minutes—Election of chairman—Election of overseers—Election of parish committee—Clerk and treasurer—Appointment of officers of parish—Officers for joint parishes—Officers not to contract with parish—Officers entrusted with money to give security—Power to appoint committees—Joint committees for two or more parishes—Administration of poor laws—Overseers and Guardians of parish to form

Board of Guardians—Overseers and poor relief committee to administer outdoor relief—Execution of Public Health Acts by parish—County Council to exercise powers of Local Government Board as to outdoor relief—Works provided for two or more parishes to be carried on by joint committee—Appointment of Medical Officer of Health by County Council—Reports by medical officer to parish and County Council—Parish committee to fulfil duties imposed by Section 17 until appointment of sanitary committee or joint committee—County Council to exercise powers of Local Government Board under Public Health Acts—County Council to appoint judicial committee to hear appeals—County Council to hold local enquiries—Appeal by parishes to Local Government Board against action of County Council—Powers to Local Government Board to interfere in case of default of County Council—Reservation of powers to Local Government Board to make general orders under Public Health Acts as heretofore—Parish to exercise powers and duties of School Board—Parish to exercise powers and duties of school attendance committee—Education Department may invest parish with powers and duties of School Board—Administration of laws relating to highways—Powers of highway surveyor or highway board to be exercised by parish—Administration of parish charitable trusts to be vested in parish—Administration of allotments to be vested in parish—Administration of various Acts to be transferred to parish—Accounts—Half-yearly estimates of expenditure—Rates—Payment of expenses—Audit of accounts—Notice, writ, or legal process upon inhabitants to be served upon vestry clerk, chairman or overseer—Appointed day—Act not to extend to Scotland or Ireland.

---

---

## PART V.

---

*Appendix of Finchley Vestry Minutes, with table shewing Assessments, Rates, and Meetings from 1780 to 1841*

*Page 157*

## PART I.

---

### THE PRESENT POSITION AND ITS DIFFICULTIES.

---

#### *Chapter I.—Causes of Extravagance and Mismanagement among Local Authorities with large areas.*

---

THE well grounded fear that apathy and indifference on the part of ratepayers must conduce to extravagance and mismanagement by Local Authorities, has given rise to general complaint and anxiety about the trifling degree of interest which the ratepayers evince in local elections of the larger sort. The ratepayers are accused of being “lazy and apathetic,” while energetic canvassers declare that they cannot prevail upon one in ten to take the trouble of recording their votes. In commenting upon the inaugural meeting of the London Defence League, called into existence to influence the last election of the London County Council, the *Times*\* discussed the prospects of rousing the ratepayer, and the question whether, if roused, he would “relapse once more into the ovine ‘submissiveness now habitual to him.’” An “ovine submissiveness” is not natural to the ratepayer, but he has learned how helpless his position has been made for him. It is the ratepayer’s position that has been made “ovine.” His interest and his right of interference in his local affairs have been suppressed by the compulsion imposed upon him to make a surrender of all his power for a three years’ period. Except during the brief moment of electing a new authority, “ovine submissiveness” has been made his portion, and, with time, it may probably become his habit. There is nothing left to sustain an intelligent interest in local affairs on the part of the electorate. When such affairs are under the management of the ratepayers the

\* June 15th, 1891.

mind of the neighbourhood engages itself actively upon them. Through the constant opportunities which meetings and discussion create, the best local ability is discovered and employed, and as there is little room for ignorance, the intrusion of party politics into practical questions affecting local welfare appears absurd. Now the triennial plebiscite has become a mere battle between party factions, in which election cajolery and interested misrepresentation are employed to snatch the ratepayer's vote. The ordeal is so degrading and so senseless that not unthoughtful ratepayers reasonably keep aloof alike from voting and from candidature. The difficulty of getting candidates of a desirable sort is increasing at every election. Candidates from a distance, unknown to the constituency, having no connection with or knowledge of its local affairs, present themselves to the electorate upon no intelligible qualification, except that of political partisanship. A position more false and more corrupting can hardly be conceived. It is in the main to be ascribed to the suppression of the rights and the duties of direct control by the ratepayers. They have now been pushed too far from an understanding of, and from influence over, their local affairs to feel any likelihood of benefit from troubling themselves about them. They see and suffer from the effects of blunders and waste in administration; they know that corruption must be hovering about such management; but, having lost the means for practical participation in local business, they cannot acquire the knowledge upon which an appreciative interest in it must depend. It is one of the consequences of the situation into which they have fallen that the ratepayers do not rebel against the legislation which has deprived them of all effective control over their local affairs. They have, naturally, become apathetic and indifferent about evils beyond their power to cure. It need hardly be added that apathy and indifference on the part of the ratepayer in his local affairs must in time inevitably lead to a decline in the quality and the trustworthiness of the elected authorities.

The ratepayers, both urban and rural, formerly used to meet and advise together and had power to control the practical local matters with which they were in touch;

now, as an exchange for this important practical power, they elect men to a Board whose work is carried on out of the range of their knowledge and influence. The work is taken out of the knowledge and influence of the ratepayers, yet the control of the central departments, particularly over rural authorities, is absolute and can be exercised from day to day. The object commonly asserted for legislative proposals about local government is *Decentralization* in some form or degree; still the actual result accomplished by such legislation generally gives more or less help to the work of founding a comprehensive and powerful bureaucratic system for the centralized control of local affairs. It has indeed become an ordinary artifice of Parliamentary rhetoric to describe as “Decentralization” and “an extension of the powers of local self-government,” those changes in local government by which local wirepullers, through their manipulation of local elections, are enabled to “control” the ratepayer.

There are, however, other causes why large local authorities are so frequently blundering and wasteful in administration and prone to suffer from jobbery. The members themselves are generally not in close enough touch with the practical part of their work to be interested by it, though such work is most keenly interesting for those who intimately grapple with it, as small local bodies must do. Large local authorities tend to have souls above their work. They are very sensitive to the foolish prodding of supercilious critics in the Press and elsewhere; in fact, they feel an uneasy sense of their own importance, and that they have a stage career to fill. They are told, for instance, by the *Times* that they must not be “glorified vestries,” but must be interesting and appeal to the imagination.\* Hectoring stimulants of this kind cannot be withstood without the tenacity of purpose which a thorough understanding and a practical grip of work provide, but no large local authority can ever be near enough to its work to acquire this mainstay, and consequently it becomes feverishly meddlesome. The Progressives of the new London County Council of 1892 have

\* “The municipality of London must appeal to the imagination as well as to the pocket.”—*Times*, June 15, 1891.

really followed the advice given by the *Times*. Their programme is “interesting,” it “appeals to the imagination,” and it will probably also appeal “to the pocket”; and yet the *Times* has inconsistently opposed the Progressives. When affairs are fought upon an abstract basis, there are always hot and cold fits, and much wild hitting.

A want of true local knowledge produces the mistakes and extravagance which characterise the action of large local authorities. Corruption fastens itself upon their helplessness, for sound local administration must be based upon an appreciation of local needs acquired by contact with the actual necessities of the locality. Unfortunately an authority governing a large area cannot obtain local knowledge of this sort, it cannot unravel evidence, nor deliberate upon it with the practice and care required for the many difficult matters of practical local welfare. The time at its disposal is utterly insufficient for these things. The meeting place of a large local body is far away from the place of residence of most of its members, and this inconvenience both limits the frequency of meeting, and shortens the time which can be given by members to their work. More mind is required for local business, but the quantity of business to be pushed through at every meeting is necessarily so great that practically a perfunctory sanction to reports from committees or from officials is all that is possible.

A large local authority is necessarily compelled to divide itself into numerous committees. From the nature of local business this is very injurious, because no sufficient opportunity is afforded to the general body of members to contribute the suggestions and correction arising out of their personal observation and knowledge of facts in their own localities. To read a report and adopt the opinion of the official making it, can be no real substitute for personal examination where the facts lie. It is a living acquaintance with local facts and requirements which constitutes the essential qualification for the management of local interests. The committee system, extravagantly extended as it must be in the case of large local authorities, takes away from the general body of members the evidence and the understanding upon which decisions

Large local areas a cause of degeneration in local administration.

Multiplication of Committees compels blind decisions.

have been arrived at by the committees, and, in the absence of such details of information, how can the recommendations of a committee be criticised or controlled? It is notorious that if effective criticism of, or control over, the recommendations of committees be attempted, it is often resented and resisted as showing a want of confidence in the committee. There is no want of confidence in the good faith of the committee, but there is often evidence that, through its local knowledge being of necessity confined to those parts of the area, with which its members are acquainted, the committee has been unable to appreciate the merits of the question with which it has dealt.

In fact, the local business of a number of parishes cannot be accomplished by a large body, and such bodies soon cease to attempt its accomplishment. The number of officials is increased and the local work is distributed among them. It is in this way that the officials gradually absorb the opportunities for acquiring dependable information, and are enabled to practically control decisions upon the details of local business. Thus, though the members are nominally responsible, they cannot really exercise control over their officials who in consequence of their more precise knowledge exercise a commanding influence upon the decisions of important business. This of itself is a source of great danger, because the officials of a local authority live in an atmosphere of contracts and expenditure, and the pecuniary interests involved are often of enormous importance.

When popular indignation vents itself in vague allegations of incompetence and jobbery against a large local authority it misses its true mark. The fault really arises from allowing large local authorities to exercise an administration requiring a local knowledge far more strict and abundant than it is possible for them to acquire. In a small area, such as a parish, administration rests upon the evidence and understanding of matters within sight; the quantity of business is not too large, and the rate-payers feel the necessity of interesting themselves about it, as they are able to influence management to an important extent. In a large area these securities are obviously overwhelmed; there cannot be local knowledge

Large local areas render administration too exclusively official.

Necessity for keeping separately in view the true functions of small and large local authorities.

for administration on the part of the general body of the members, consequently the power for management of a local authority, with very extensive area, is largely an affectation, and its responsibility a phrase. On the other hand, there are functions of indispensable importance naturally belonging to large local authorities, if allowed to assist as well as to regulate and control the small primary administrative bodies. It should be part of the duty of large Local Authorities to assist in the organization of the national control over general local administration throughout the country, though their direct powers for administration should be restricted to matters of local interest collectively important to their district.

---

## PART I.

*Chapter II.—The Local Government Proposals of 1888.*

Overwhelming  
details of Local  
Government  
Bill of 1888.

THE popular acceptance of the changes in Local Government for England and Wales proposed by the Bill of 1888, was based on the assumption that it was a project for extensive decentralization. A Bill of 125 clauses, depending for interpretation upon perhaps 40 Acts of Parliament, cannot be investigated without adequate time; its mere mass at first paralyzes effectual criticism, and thus a considerable part of the Bill passed into law before it was possible to form a balanced judgment upon the probable results of redistributing and conferring so many powers. While the first part (the County Councils part) of the Bill was passing through Parliament, it became clear to many on both sides of the House that the third part (the District Councils part) would largely centralize administration instead of decentralizing it. The country required a comprehensive plan dealing with the three most serious defects of existing Local Government. Public opinion expected:—

(1). That the complex entanglement of areas for poor relief, for elementary education, for the administration of the Sanitary Acts, the Highway Acts, the Burial and other Acts, would be simplified and reduced. Under existing arrangements as many as twelve different local authorities may exercise power apart from one another within a rural parish—a state of things which carries upon its face a verdict of wasteful and vexatious confusion.

(2.) That the dangerous and extravagant system under which so many local authorities within the same area spend money independently of one another, and exercise powers of rating and of borrowing money upon the security of the property of the inhabitants, would be consolidated. It was hoped that this result would be achieved in such a manner that the total burden imposed upon the ratepayers for current rates and outstanding debts and loan liabilities could be clearly brought into view, and that at the same time both the spending and the taxing for local affairs would be dealt with and rest together upon one undivided responsibility.

(3.) That the present system by which, especially in rural parts, the ratepayers are so much shut out from the control and management of their parish affairs, would give place to a wiser system, under which large powers of direct self-management would be conferred upon the ratepayers.

The Local Government Bill, however, as introduced, disappointed every one of these natural and reasonable expectations. It left the complex entanglement of areas as perplexing as before. It furnished no basis for the better control of local expenditure and debt, and gave no increase in powers for local control, while it left local interests helplessly subject as heretofore to the delays, the indifference and the local ignorance of centralized authority. In rural parts the Bill clearly aimed at sweeping away all that was left of parochial self-management, but it interfered little with Urban Districts, except that Local Boards changed their name to Urban District Councils. The fact that the District Councils Clauses of the Bill offered no settlement soon became generally palpable and irresistible.

These reforms  
not attempted,  
but remaining  
powers of Parish  
extinguished.

Entanglement  
of areas.  
Extravagance  
from authorities  
spending, rating  
and borrowing  
independently.

Helpless position  
of ratepayers.

It was fortunate that the exigencies of Parliamentary time stopped its progress for that Session, thus affording to the country a period of delay in which a judgment could be formed upon the probable results of the Bill.

Rapid legislation assists departments in keeping and acquiring power.

Those who agree with the late Cardinal Newman "that 'to centralize is the art and trick of despots, to decentralize is the necessary wisdom of those who love good government,'" will probably be of opinion that in a bureaucratic system of local government, such as our own is fast becoming, departmental despotism acquires great resources for defence by an accumulation of experience in "the art and trick of despots." A Local Government Bill is, of course, framed by the departments. Our officials have too much zeal and too much ability voluntarily to part with power if they can avoid it. They have ample leisure. A Local Government Bill is under their consideration for a long period before Parliament or the public see it, and *as they are not hurried*, they can calculate with tolerable accuracy the administrative working of provisions too intricate for anyone else to understand within the time a session allows between the introduction of a Bill and its passing into law. Of late this unfairness has become worse, because the anxiety to force legislation has led to important Bills being introduced late in the session when members find the deliberative capacity and opportunity of Parliament so reduced by the pressure of business, that resistance, short of throwing the Bill out, is felt to be hopeless.

Below County Councils, Bill would have imposed centralization.

It is freely enough admitted that serious dangers and progressive degradation in national tone are sure to develop under a centralized bureaucratic system, and probably in sympathy with that feeling, the Bill of 1888 was commonly recommended as a great decentralizing proposal. A very careful examination of the provisions of the Bill is, however, required to detect whether its centralizing or decentralizing influences would have had more play, and to strike a balance between them. In fact the passing of the 1888 Act was a parliamentary leap into darkness, and the portion of the scheme dealing with local administration below the area of County Councils bore the unmistakable stamp of departmental inclination. It was

calculated to pacify the demands of some modern political plausibilities, but its proposals would have carried the most sweeping centralization into the local government of rural parts.

FIRSTLY, this would have been effected by a system of *Firstly—By subjecting inhabitants to Local Authority* partial retirement of the members of District Councils, so that each parish would elect only once in three years, the inhabitants being thus deprived of all but the merest semblance of control over the new local authority.

SECONDLY, the new local authority, while made independent of the ratepayers, was to be placed in complete subordination to the Central Department with its intimate official regulation, and Expert and Inspectorial dictation. *Secondly—By subjecting Local Authority to Central Departments.*

---

## PART I.

### *Chapter III.—The Existing Boards of Guardians and the Proposed Rural District Councils.*

As local bodies intended to elicit local wishes about *Existing Boards of Guardians.* local requirements, and to give play to local judgment and responsibility, the existing Boards of Guardians are counterfeits. They are not representative of the rural population, but in the character ascribed to them they provide a veil for covering the action of officials, who are in the main responsible to the central authority. Boards of Guardians are thus made to act as local outposts and delegates of the central government, and in a variety of ways to serve as a screen for centralizing administration. The assumption that they are really representative bodies is a misconception which prevents an appreciation of their true character and of their working.

The spirit of self-management and local responsibility, which formerly gave healthy life to rural communities, has been, and is still decaying under the influence of the Union Board, whose authority by superseding that of the parish, *Spirit of local self-management broken down.*

submerges all effective individual expression of its wants and feelings. The Poor Law Union machinery provides neither compensation nor a substitute to the ratepayers for the loss of their ancient right and power to discuss and decide for themselves upon matters affecting their interests and the advantage of their parish, and its ignorance of and want of sympathy with parish needs operates as a clog and a hindrance to local development and welfare. Moreover, the Poor Law Union, by its enormous area, necessarily reduces the local knowledge and local feeling, indispensable to the satisfactory direction of local affairs, to administrative impotence.

The following Table (excluding the Metropolis) shows how the parishes of England and Wales are distributed between the Poor Law Unions:—

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Number of unions comprising less than 10 parishes . . . . . | 105 |
| "        "        "    10 and up to 20 parishes             | 171 |
| "        "        "    20 and up to 40 parishes             | 259 |
| "        "        "    40 and up to 60 parishes             | 65  |
| "        "        "    60 and up to 80 parishes             | 15  |
| "        "        "    80 and up to 100 parishes            | 3   |
| Total number of unions                                      | 618 |

Table of  
Parishes as  
distributed  
among Unions.

Union Boards  
too bulky to  
manage  
Parishes.

Many of the parishes in unions containing less than ten are urban. The greater number of rural unions comprise between ten and sixty parishes, and an area roughly averaging 100 square miles; while some extend to over 200 square miles. The average population of a union may be regarded as about 45,000. Poor Law Guardian management is necessarily ill-informed, because the intimate knowledge and personal regard and care indispensable for local administration cannot be obtained in unions with very many parishes, ranging over a large area. Each parish has one elected guardian, some parishes have more than one. In large unions, if guardians attend, the Board is unwieldy and impatient of details, though it is by clearing the knowledge about local facts, and by attention to details that parish welfare is most essentially affected. Matters which are vital to the well-being of a parish may appear petty to a bulky Union Board. It cannot really enter into the requirements of a large number

of separate communities, nor acquire the information necessary to protect its parishes against incapacity and indifference on the part of its officials. The parishes become dumb through their inability to struggle against the dead weight of official centralization. What can a Guardian do for his parish at meetings of representatives of 30, 50, or 70 parishes? All of them, presumably, are asked to look after every parish as if it was their own. How can they do so? They have not the requisite knowledge, inclination, or time. It is quite impossible, and consequently by the agency of the union area the parishes swamp one another, and all useful parochial articulation is overborne or stifled.

Though the matters confided to Poor Law Guardians affect vitally the interests and welfare of the poorer part of the rural population, it is practically impossible for persons belonging to that class to become Guardians, because the time and expense involved are too great. One great object of local institutions in rural parts should be to give agricultural labourers a share in management. The agricultural labourer should be able to have members of his own class upon the jury for local administration in a rural area. Such persons, as the Poor Law Report of 1834 abundantly testifies, are frequently found to be most practical and capable of dealing with local business. If they are to be elbowed out how will their class be represented? Are they to give hire to some windbag agitator or to leave the delicate duty to the parson or the tenant farmer? The parson may not be always best qualified by impartiality and business-like habit, and the tenant farmer, if practical and business-like, is yet from the pressure of his position sometimes occupied by two ideas—first to make the most out of his landlord, and next to make the most out of his labourers. Owing to the needlessly burdensome character of the office very few persons of desirable qualifications can be induced to serve, and election, accepted as a favour, is not felt to impose much obligation. *The union meeting-place is necessarily distant from most of the parishes. The meetings must take place in the daytime and absorb the working day. Members must possess a horse, or be able to pay for one, as the journey is usually across*

Daytime  
meetings and  
distant meeting-  
places prevent  
desirable persons  
from becoming  
Union  
Guardians.

*country.* These weighty and serious objections not only prevent a true representaton of the great body of the rural population, but also deter capable persons with daytime occupations from offering themselves for election. It is notoriously difficult to get the duties of a Guardian carefully fulfilled. The position is not sought after, and scarcely any choice is possible. Guardians frequently continue in office through default of a proper election. Attendance is extremely irregular, and in some parts Guardians find themselves unable to attend for long periods, owing to the difficulties of the journey, and their parishes consequently are without a voice in the distant Union Board. Those having practical experience of the duties feel it to be absurdly unreasonable that a Guardian should be taken away from his parish and have to face such difficulties of journey in order that he may be brought to deliberate with other Guardians, who, like himself, know little and care little for the affairs of any parish but their own. The matters administered are for the most part intrinsically parochial in their nature, and *there is not a sufficient community of practical interests between the parishes to give a purpose and reason for collective deliberation upon a Union or District Councel Board.*

Rural District  
Councils practi-  
cally identical  
with Boards of  
Guardians, and  
both useless for  
rural self-  
government.

The leading feature of the third part of the 1888 Local Government Bill was the District Council system, and the creation of District Councils seems to be popularly assumed as the main object of any new proposal for the extension of Local Government. The falsity of the assumption that some great amelioration in local management would arise through the creation of District Councils has not yet been generally detected. The District Council scheme of the Bill of 1888 would, however, have brought about no change of consequence except that the few powers of local self-management still resting with the rural parishes would have been absorbed by the District Councils. In other respects what change would District Councils have brought about? Certainly nothing to check waste and extravagance by concentrating the spending powers of various independent local authorities into *one financial responsibility, controllable by the ratepayers.* Instead of the Union Board acting as it now does in different capacities, its present

various duties would have been discharged by the Board of Guardians and the Rural District Councils set up side by side as twin authorities. This scheme of local reform by Rural District Councils instead, therefore, of reducing the number of *independent* spending and taxing authorities would have added one more to their already intolerable number, with results inevitably provocative of waste and extravagance. Nothing would have been done to reduce or simplify areas, and the Rural District Council area would have been the same as the Union area. By that fact alone, the hollowness of the proposal of the Bill of 1888, as a scheme for conferring and extending the powers of local self-government in rural districts, is made apparent. The mere creation of two bodies to discharge the duties hitherto performed by one of them would have done nothing to increase local control. The smaller ratepayers would have had no chance of obtaining a candidate from their own class. The conditions of the large area imperatively impose the *daytime service* and the *distant meeting place* equally upon the Rural District Council and the Board of Guardians, and as it is now difficult to find one suitable person willing to act as Guardian, the very much greater difficulty of finding two serviceable candidates leaves little room for believing that local control could have been increased by distant Rural District Councils. In rural parishes the two separate elections would almost everywhere have produced the grotesque result of one and the same person being appointed to represent the parish in the double capacity of Poor Law Guardian and Rural District Councillor. Those having rural local knowledge must be forced to this opinion, and, if a sound opinion, it is commentary enough upon the suggestion of Pural District Councils. These bodies would have done nothing to reduce or simplify areas, to check extravagance, or to increase local control. Indeed, an examination of the proposal shows that RURAL DISTRICT COUNCILS WOULD HAVE PRACTICALLY PERPETUATED BOARD OF GUARDIAN MANAGEMENT UNDER A MERE CHANGE OF NAME. The relation and subjection to centralizing management, county or imperial, would, in the case of Local Government under Rural District Councils, scarcely have varied from what it now is under the Boards of Guardians.

Would have  
reduced the  
influence of  
inhabitants to  
vanishing point.

It is singular that in a proposal, having the objects claimed by the Bill of 1888, it should have been contemplated to further reduce the little influence rural ratepayers still retain over the management of their own parish affairs. As a practical effect of the measure however their influence would have been greatly impaired, because, though the law requires Guardians to be chosen every year, the Bill of 1888 substituted powers by which rural parishes, with one Rural District Councillor, could only have elected a representative to the Rural District Council **ONCE IN THREE YEARS.** A three year instead of one year election interval, would pretty well extinguish the control of ratepayers over their representative at a distant Rural Board. Moreover, the new District Council Board would have been fashioned upon the close system so favourable to centralizing influence and local subserviency, because one-third only of its members were to go out at each election, so that the ratepayers would always have a two-thirds residuum independent of them. Of what possible advantage to rural ratepayers could such a District Council be? What the ratepayers really require, and ought to obtain, is the opportunity to express their views, and influence the management of local affairs in the parish in which they live. This power would be of substantial, practical, and even moral value to the agricultural poor. The power to vote in any fashion whatever, for those persons only whose circumstances would enable them to spend the working day as Guardians or Rural District Councillors at a distant Board is of no real advantage to the agricultural poor. So far as they are concerned, the Bill of 1888 pretended to effect an amelioration which it did not provide, because, in spite of new names and changes of trifling importance, the power to share in the management where their local knowledge lies and their local interests are concerned, that is, in the parish in which they are fixed by the necessities of their livelihood, was denied to the ratepayers.

## PART I.

*Chapter IV.—The Parish as the Local Unit.*

IT is only in newly inhabited countries that areas and boundaries can be created afresh. With a long-settled population the local traditions and existing local feelings support ancient divisions and stimulate strong opposition to their overthrow upon reasons which cannot be justly appreciated apart from local surroundings. To put together a number of old areas and treat them as one appears a simple process; but if imposed *from above* by a central authority, it is sure to encounter objections. The isolation and the aversion which surround the poor law union are illustrative of the usual failure attending such schemes. Separate parishes and village communities have so many different and even foreign characteristics and are frequently so anxious for their preservation that they cannot be forced into an artificial connection, though in the days of parochial independence voluntary combinations between parishes for special purposes used to be frequent and successful. Such combinations, however, sprang from a desire for greater fitness and convenience in the working of local and livelihood affairs, they were framed to meet an active local desire, and were shaped by a complete knowledge of local circumstances. Combinations *imposed from above fail* because they are the endeavours of theoretical or political carpentry, whereas the combinations evolved *from below succeed* because they are true organic developments.

In old Countries new local areas cannot be imposed by central authority.

Our *secular* parishes are themselves products of an organic development, and as their origin lies back beyond any evidence on record, they may be regarded for all purposes of local management as without a beginning. In 1297 (25th Edward I.) it was ordained by Parliament that "in each parish four men shall be chosen by the parishioners, who shall return the assessment of the parish

Secular Parishes go back beyond record as units of local self-government.

to the Shire authorities." Toulmin Smith, in his work upon *The Parish*,\* says: "The records are to this day "extant, in a state almost entire, of the actual assessment "and returns made by all the parishes of most of the "counties of England, about the year 1340. The names, "even of the committees or juries of most of the hundreds "and parishes are contained in this invaluable record. "By many incidental allusions, as well as its whole direct "tenour, this record proves the entire control of all the "affairs of every parish to have been then in the hands "of the inhabitants of the parish." The five hundred years and more since the time at which this evidence of parochial self-dependence was furnished cover the period of greatest national growth, and it is hardly possible to doubt that the habits of self action in parish affairs have largely contributed to the practical methods and public self reliance which are strongly marked in Englishmen. The full powers and responsibility then possessed by parishes brought their inhabitants under a pressure calculated to strengthen their faculty for co-operation and public action. They would be under the necessity of frequently deliberating together upon their parish affairs, and would thus be likely to attain a clear knowledge of these affairs, of one another, and, generally, sound public aptitudes. Nothing could be more opposed to the condition of ignorance and helplessness for the management of their local affairs which official centralization finds itself upon, and unconsciously does so much to extend. Upon the value of the *Parish Institution* as a school of self-government, Erskine May, in his *Constitutional History*,† says:

"That Englishmen have been qualified for the enjoyment of "political freedom is mainly due to those ancient local institutions by "which they have been trained to self-government. England alone "among the nations of the earth has maintained for centuries a "constitutional polity, and her liberties may be ascribed, above all "things, to her free institutions."

"Since the days of their Saxon ancestors her sons have learned at "their own gates the duties and responsibilities of citizens."

"Associating for the common good they have become exercised in "public affairs. Thousands of small communities have been separately "trained to self-government, taxing themselves through their

"representatives for local objects, meeting for discussion and business, "and animated by local rivalries and ambitions."

"Every parish is the image and reflection of the State. The "lands, the Church, and the Commonalty share in its government, "the aristocratic and democratic elements are combined in its society."

"The common law, in its grand simplicity, recognised the right of "all the rated parishioners to assemble in Vestry and administer "parochial affairs."

The general affairs of the people in their local customs and in matters of common interest have by usage acquired a practice and character specially adapted to the ancient parochial divisions. It is in the parish only that a true local self-government can be said to exist; in larger areas it is possible for officials to monopolize information, and consequently to defy all real control. But in the parish this cannot be done, because the facts lie at every man's door; the affairs of his parish touch every man's interest, comfort and feelings, and his knowledge about parish concerns is definite and practical. Indeed the parish is so much a true and strong citadel of practical local independence that the social and political doctrinaire can do nothing with it; hence the continual attacks which centralization makes upon the parish to reduce its independence, and to lower the inconvenient spirit and force of its public life.

The population of parishes in England and Wales, according to Return made in 1881, was as follows :—

Traditional and  
general customs  
rest upon Parish,  
hence its  
persistent  
vitality.

|  | Number of<br>Parishes. |
|--|------------------------|
| With population under 50.. .. ..         | 773                    |
| ,,     above 50 and under 100 .. ..      | 1,143                  |
| ,,     above 100 and under 200 .. ..     | 2,398                  |
| ,,     above 200 and under 500 .. ..     | 4,443                  |
| ,,     above 500 and under 1,000 .. ..   | 2,628                  |
| ,,     above 1,000 and under 2,000 .. .. | 1,475                  |
| ,,     above 2,000 and under 5,000 .. .. | 1,057                  |
| ,,     above 5,000 .. .. ..              | 844                    |
| Total number of parishes .. .. ..        | <u>14,761</u>          |

Table of  
population of  
Parishes.

It may be assumed that some of the parishes over 2,000, and many of the parishes over 5,000 population, are urban, and that, with those exceptions, the remainder, probably over 13,000, are rural parishes.

No valid reason  
for objecting to  
small parishes.

There is much outcry about the smallness of parishes, and many difficulties connected with their administration are vaguely asserted to exist. These difficulties, however, have no real existence, but in an indefinite shape they present themselves to the official mind as a consequence of its inherent distrust of independent and direct self-management in local affairs. Direct personal management by the ratepayers presents no difficulty in small parishes; indeed the smaller they are the more close and regardful will be the interest necessarily felt by the ratepayers in their management. In a small parish the local affairs of the ratepayers are within their sight and as much within their understanding as their own personal business would be, and to see and understand matters which one is keenly interested about and can control, affords the best of all guarantees against wastefulness and corruption. A small parish is able to manage without paid officials, a fact obviously conducive to economy and purity of administration. A perusal of the vestry minutes of many parishes taken during the period of full parochial responsibility and freedom, will show the solicitude, carefulness, and respect for personal and constitutional rights exhibited by the inhabitants of small parishes. The advantage is altogether with the small parishes, and the difficulties to which they are supposed to give rise have no existence, but are a mere myth created by the interested prejudices and associations of official sentiment. It is far more probable that difficulties should arise in the large parishes where the conditions do not allow local affairs to be so much in view. Formerly the ratepayers, feeling this inconvenience, frequently divided large parishes into smaller areas for the secular purposes of management of the poor and of the roads, and thus secured a more strict responsibility on the part of the overseers and surveyors to whom such subdivisions were separately allotted. The smallness of these areas stimulated the vigilance of the ratepayers and gave a practical effect to it which prevented anything arbitrary, secret, or corrupt from being done contrary to their common interest and wishes.

In populous parishes the appointment of parish committees enabled the inhabitants, as *neighbours of the neces-*

Parish  
Committees  
acted during  
consent.

---

sity, to apportion between them the burdens of local duty. Parish committees appointed to act during the consent of the inhabitants cannot develop the weakness and dangers which attend committees or Boards elected for long fixed periods and so placed beyond the control of the inhabitants.

---

## PART I.

### *Chapter V.—The Parish and Rural Depopulation.*

---

THERE is no graver or more imminent danger to the strength and development of the nation than that connected with the constant drifting of population from the country into the towns. The country child lives in pure open air, he has hardships, but on the whole his environment increases his physical strength and capacity for endurance. The town life of poor children on the other hand entails physical shrinkage, both in size and faculty. We owe our Colonial Empire and our place among other nations to the healthy physical development of country life. How can a people of enfeebled physique, with the excitable, but sickly, nervous system of our town poor, make an enduring nation?

Among the influences contributing to rural depopulation the most active and serious are those arising out of the suppression of local self-management. The existing centres, whether they are called Union Boards or District Council Boards, by their distant situation and unwieldy area are forced to make all their action either official or personally arbitrary; everything shrivels under them as under the blast of the East wind; they are utterly disconnected in

Perverse  
deportation of  
local business  
makes country  
life dull, but this  
dulness powers  
for sound self-  
government  
would sweep  
away.

feeling and understanding from parish purposes. The atmosphere of obstructive repression which they engender is, however, only a part of the evil to which they give rise. Formerly the villages themselves gave scope and purpose for local endeavour. Their little districts were entities satisfying to local sentiment; the lines of area in local management were drawn *to meet in them*; now they pass *through them*, and destroy the conscious independence and local self-respect which used to nourish rural contentment. Those having good opportunity for observation must incline to the view that local management under the union area tends to create a distaste for country life, and by comparison, increases the attractiveness of the towns as centres of power and direction. Country people are said to migrate to towns because life in the country is dull. *Nothing can be more depressing and better calculated to make life dull than the sense of inferiority created by having the transaction of local affairs perversely removed out of the knowledge and handling of the district to a remote and locally ignorant authority*, whether the Union Board or the District Council. The bantering suggestion which has been made in high quarters that some *amusement* is required displays a wide misreading of the case. The question is one not of amusement, but of the self-respect of local populations, which is grievously humiliated by having to surrender the working of the local affairs of their immediate neighbourhood. What can be more provokingly tantalizing than to have all one's own local affairs deported to a distant authority, unable either to understand or to spend time upon them? To the people concerned their practical local affairs are more interesting than any *amusement*; they understand and are anxious about them, but persons do not closely engage their minds upon local business in which they have no personal concern—it appears unintelligible and is wearisome to them. Under a centralized management, blundering from ignorance and over-pressure, a melancholy subordination prevails which contributes to rural depopulation.

The existing situation is one of depressing emptiness. It thrusts aside the only people who can be depended upon for the patient consideration and intelligent transac-

tion of local business. It produces a sense of degraded condition and an irritating anxiety to get out of it. If a rational local independence could be created, it would do much to counterpoise the attractions which town life now presents to country people. Local responsibility for the management of local affairs formerly gave a dignified and gratifying autonomy to rural life; attachment was felt to one's parish, and pride in one's county. Neither feeling is evoked by the union area. Under the deadening absorption which spreads from it over the country, the elemental value of country life to the poor in health, and happiness are lost sight of. Rural depopulation is largely an effect of rebellion against the practical serfdom which is imposed upon country life by the senseless centralization of its local government. It stamps everywhere subjection and emptiness, and thus constantly draws the best and strongest towards the towns.

Parish self-government would give the agricultural labourer a real chance, probably his only chance, of improving his condition. What can be done to help him must be done within his parish. Any legislation for his benefit is sure to be impotent unless he is himself enabled to have a share in management. Parish meetings in open vestry held on days and at times most convenient to the ratepayer would give him a share in practical management, an opportunity of speaking for himself, and of protecting public rights in which he has a share. There is either affectation or ignorance in supposing that a Guardian or District Councillor at a remote and unwieldy Union Board, or District Council Board, can do anything for the agricultural labourer. He ought to be allowed to feel his own way to a better condition, and a better security than he now possesses, and the only opportunity for such solid progress is by a development of parish institutions. Open vestry meetings would mitigate the debilitating vacancy of village life, afford the rural population practical influence of weight in their rural affairs, and enable them to profit by legislation intended for their benefit in the place they are living in—their parish.

Parish self-government would give to agricultural labourers real opportunity for general improvement.

Cultivation in small holdings would arrest rural depopulation, but Parish Institutions are required.

There is probably now more real servitude under our present system of large farms, commercially managed, and local government taken out of the sight and knowledge of the poor, than existed in the reign of Elizabeth. Large tracts of land which, in small holdings, would foster a population healthy in body and self-reliant in mind, exhibit a mere apology for cultivation. The Chinese say: "*We manure our land with mind,*" but this is a manure which can rarely be applied with sufficiency, except in the case of small holdings of land, because the numerous and constant requirements of large holdings present too many demands upon the mind, the capital and the labour that can be applied to the land. The agricultural practice of the Chinese, from time immemorial, gives its sanction to the latest development of Western agricultural science; they have long known that leguminous crop manuring gives nitrogen, and therefore clover growing is a large feature of their agriculture. The discovery (to us) that nitrogen can be secured by crop attraction must, as it becomes fully appreciated, greatly modify the present methods of our own agriculture. The agriculture of the future will owe less to costly artificial manures, or heavy stock keeping, and such a change will obviously confer particular advantages upon small cultivations. Small occupations and small ownerships would be of benefit to every class in the nation, and afford to country labourers opportunities of acquiring an independent condition, but unless parish institutions giving powers of administration to those having personal interest in the management, and *a knowledge of the ground*, are provided, all the time spent in theorising over Allotment Acts and Small Holding Acts will be wasted. Small occupiers and owners, as a class, would be specially anxious to take, and specially capable of taking, part in local management, but the time and distance involved by management under the Union or the District Council area would shut them out.

## PART I.

*Chapter VI.—The Parish and Compounding for Rates.*

THE 59 George III. chap. 12 was the first Act by which the liability for rates was transferred from the owner to the occupier. The system was, however, much more fully brought into operation by the Small Tenements Act, 13 and 14 Vic. chap. 99. This Act if adopted by vestries rendered owners of cottages, below £6 annual value, liable for the rates instead of the occupier. As the owner under this Act paid a less sum than the occupier would have had to pay, they were thus considered to compound for the rate, and the occupiers under this arrangement were consequently called “compound householders.” The principle of “personal payment of rates,” as opposed to “compounding for rates,” has given rise to many important political battles; it did so particularly in connection with the Reform Act of 1867. In 1869 the compounding system was established on a wider basis than before. By Section 7 of the Poor Rate Amendment and Collection Act, passed in that year, personal payment of rates as a condition of the franchise was given up, and, according to the nature of the undertaking imposed upon or accepted by the owner, an allowance was made to him which varied from 15 per cent. to 30 per cent. Since 1869 there has been no further legislation upon the subject.

Compounding cannot be defended upon any higher ground than that of the convenience it offers for the collection of rates. The weight of argument is on the side of “personal payment of rates,” because the recognition and the performance of public duty, enforced upon every individual, give the sense of personal connection with local rights and obligations which is required to engage responsibility in an active tangible way. Should the present system of compounding for rates be suffered long

Legislation  
on rate com-  
pounding.

Compounding  
lowers  
self-respect and  
destroys  
parochial order  
and equality.

to continue, it is to be feared that the agricultural poor will never really secure the advantages which a quickened parochial life ought to confer. If compounders are able to control the purposes and direct the administration of expenditure to which they do not feel that they themselves contribute, a condition is created tending to uproot a sound moral sense with regard to the nature of their rights. It is contrary to custom and the instincts of public feeling in such a matter, that those who personally and directly discharge their share of public burdens should be placed upon the same footing as those who, being paid for in the lump, are apparently regarded as persons from whom their share in the rate cannot conveniently or with certainty be obtained. Under an enlarged parochial life, if compounding remained, a most intolerable position would be created, not so much between one class and another, as among the poor themselves, through the jealousy and bitterness which would arise from it. The greatest among the many mischiefs to which compounding gives rise is that rural ratepayers are divided by it into two sections, and apparently thrust into a position of antagonism to one another—the non-compounders supposed to be desirous of keeping down the rates, the compounders supposed to be desirous of promoting expenditure, and this situation would palpably embitter and degrade the tone of public sentiment in local affairs.

Evidence of  
Poor Law  
Commissioners.

The Poor Law Commissioners of 1834, in their Report quote striking evidence to show the sounder understanding of public right and duty promoted by personal payment of rates :—\*

“ In Southwell, the parish paid as much as £184 per annum for rents of cottages. After Captain Nicholls had succeeded in abolishing this custom, his next step was to assess all the cottages to the rates. When he had succeeded in carrying this measure, he directed ‘the permanent overseer to give formal receipts to all the payers, though for sums no greater than 2½d. or 3d.’ ”

“ The poor looked upon these receipts in the light of testimonials of ‘their independence, and proud of showing that they, as well as their richer neighbours, contributed to the parish burdens, they hung them up in the windows of their cottages. Captain Nicholls has ordered the overseer to treat them, when he was receiving their

---

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report 1834, p. 154.

"contributions, with respect, but he was surprised at this unexpected result, and at finding that they were loth to be in arrear, and generally brought their money without solicitation on the day it was due."

"Mr. Borser states, with relation to the improved condition of the labouring classes in that parish, that—

"They have themselves told him they are better off, and it is notoriously the fact. Though he collects money for the poor rates, and all their cottages are now assessed, none of the labouring class now are ever uncivil to him. Has observed, since cottages were rated, that the tenants become very jealous of those who receive relief; they give him such information as they think will prevent his granting relief where it is not merited; will often come to his house and tell him when they think he has been imposed upon by anyone pretending to be ill. Since cottages were rated, such as apply for relief without real necessity are looked upon very shyly by others; they call it attempting to impose on one another. They are very jealous of those who receive relief, thinking and saying it is given out of their earnings."

"In Bingham it is stated—

"Great good resulted from refusing to pay rents for cottages, and from rating all cottages, and strictly enforcing payments; thinks more good came from this than almost anything else; it made all those who paid rates jealous of anyone receiving relief. Only last week a woman, to whom he went for her rate, said, 'I say I sha'n't pay any more rates if my money is thrown away. I hear that idle fellow, Jack \_\_\_\_\_, had 5s. from the parish some weeks ago, because he said his child was ill; I sha'n't pay my money to such like.' He has seen many instances of the jealousy of the poor in this respect; if they pay rates, they say they don't like to be giving their earnings to their neighbours, who are only idle; and now they abuse those who want to get help from the parish."

On the question of payment of rates there is a great difference between the class of small occupiers in urban and in rural districts. In urban districts the difficulty of and the loss upon collection are far greater. As a class the small occupiers in urban districts are, owing to their occupations, far more migratory by habit than the corresponding class in rural districts. In the villages many of the families of agricultural labourers are found to remain for generation after generation; they are as fixed as the landowners and far more so than the tenant farmers of the present day. There would be little difficulty in collecting rates from the cottagers of a rural parish, and scarcely any loss upon the collection, certainly nothing to approach the allowance made to owners upon the supposition of such loss. The moderate population of a rural parish does away with difficulty in collecting rates from the cottagers. As things stand in most rural districts the cottagers are punctual in paying their rent, and the stimulus to interest and self-respect which free parish institutions would arouse, would help a great deal in the collection of rates. In RURAL PARTS there is no need for

By compounding  
poor save  
nothing, local  
authorities lose,  
and owner  
pockets an  
allowance he  
does not earn.

compounding; it is gratuitous, has demoralising consequences, and the local authorities lose largely in consequence of it. The compounding allowances greatly exceed the average realised losses; the allowance deduction has to be compensated for by an increase in the general rating, and the non-compounding poor among other ratepayers pay the unearned compensation to the compounding landlord. The owners of the cottage property are, in fact, the only gainers by compounding, but they gain considerably, because they receive compensation far in excess of any losses they need incur. *Compounding thus not only confers no benefit, but inflicts a positive loss upon the poorer rate-payers, for they still pay the rate, but pay it without acquiring the advantages of position and of individual recognition which a personal discharge of public duty would carry with it.*

On all the grounds involved, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that the system of compounding is socially subversive and morally indefensible, and the general sense of the community, it is to be hoped, will in time come to regard it as incompatible with any large development of parochial independence and responsibility. Still it cannot be said that there exists at present a sufficiently wide appreciation of the evils entailed by compounding to encourage immediate legislation upon the subject. Under the practical working of parish institutions in rural parts, the dangers of compounding would be brought clearly into view, and a more precise local knowledge than now exists would in time be acquired upon this very serious question. Meanwhile, the fear that the compounders might act as if their interests were opposed to those of the other ratepayers may perhaps be exaggerated, for the history of popular local government presents nothing more striking than the instinctive and resolute desire of the poorer ratepayers for economy, and for good management in every way, whenever their intelligence has been frankly and fully appealed to.

The Parish Government Bill offers a safeguard against anything unfair or hasty in parish action in the supervision and power of control, which would be exercised by County Councils upon appeal. I have dealt with this in the chapter upon "*Decentralization by the Agency of County Councils,*"

Natural  
instincts for  
economy among  
poorer rate-  
payers may be  
depended upon.

Parish Govern-  
ment Bill offers  
safe-guards.

and also in that part of the chapter upon “*The Parish and Poor Relief*,” dealing with the machinery proposed under the Bill.

---

---

## PART I.

### *Chapter VII.—The Parish and Division of Duties.*

---

THE administration of poor relief, sanitary matters, education, highways and other local affairs, demands qualifications exceedingly different in their nature and rarely united in one man. Hence the acknowledged difficulty of inducing careful and disinterested men to undertake responsibility in a lump for the diverse and heavy duties heaped upon the members of a Rural or Urban authority. Men of ability and position will give valuable work for their parish upon a committee charged with a specific and limited duty, for which they feel themselves capable, though they might feel it impossible to accept responsibility for the general parish management by election to a board for a long fixed term of office. A local election, if conducted with the secrecy and wire-pulling encouraged by modern machinery, may be made one of the most repulsive ordeals a man can be called upon to pass through, whereas the request from fellow parishioners to act upon a Committee for purposes in which one has a common interest with them, must be felt by anyone to be a compliment, and can hardly be declined without grave reasons.

Better  
administration  
obtained by  
dividing parish  
duties.

Willingness to come forward becomes greater as parish duties are fairly apportioned.

If power existed in parishes to divide the administrative functions, and to assign separate functions to different persons or committees, then the personal fitness for the duty to be undertaken would be the chief consideration in making selection from among the parishioners. This division would allow a reasonable apportionment of the duties of parish management among parishioners, according to their inclinations and abilities, and would tend to restore a spirit of duty and equality in the practices and services of local self-management. By such means the local work would be far better done, and the responsible training it provides, so valuable in its practical effects, would be widely diffused and make the people stronger and more reasoning in their public habits.

---

## PART I.

### *Chapter VIII.—The Deception belonging to Parish Councils.*

---

Parish Councils upon urban basis completely unsuitable for rural parishes.

THE perplexing drift of rural population to the towns has aroused a general anxiety to promote what may be compendiously described as *Rural Amelioration*, and has consequently facilitated a vague but extensive toleration for the idea of Parish Councils. The Parish Council system appears, moreover, to be very much in favour with statesmen and politicians whose views in the main have probably been largely influenced by their experience of municipal and urban surroundings. It seems, indeed, to be very generally assumed that Parish Councils for rural parishes are likely to have a construction based upon modern urban principles. If, however, any such attempt

should be made, it ought to receive emphatic condemnation, because it would leave out of account the utterly different geographical, economic, and social conditions of rural as compared with urban life.

It is impossible to conceive anything more senselessly destructive than the modern system of electing urban local authorities would be if applied to parishes in rural parts. The urban construction of the local authority presents a contentious aspect at its commencement ; it offers nothing to the ratepayer but rules and apparatus for the conduct of a local warfare, according to modern notions. A *vote-fight*, or *voting-paper fight* appears to be imposed whether the ratepayers wish for it or not, for that is all which is presented to their view by the local machinery. There is no provision for such opportunities as would enable the inhabitants to ascertain the general position of their local affairs, and to become acquainted with the aptitudes for public business possessed by their fellow ratepayers. No statutory meeting is prescribed calling the inhabitants to consider upon their affairs and as to whom they should appoint for administration. The idea that a common interest and understanding in local affairs must lead to a common agreement for appointing the most useful and reliable persons is thrust away, and mere voting is made the sole business, though there is often no reason for voting. Of course, such purposeless voting must be a prey to unfounded hostilities and capricious personal motives of all kinds, *and it is carried out in an ignorant isolation injurious to public stamina.* The evils produced in this way are so great that there may be fair room for question, whether blind voting of such a sort is not as stupid as, and sometimes, from the wastefulness of its ultimate effects, more disastrous than even the rougher solutions of controversies which prevailed in early days.

Under the old parish organisation, on the other hand, meetings among the Ratepayers were frequent ; the sources and weight of parish opinion were appealed to, and habits of public reasoning and deliberation were fostered. In proportion as the understanding of business is sound and complete, differences of opinion are necessarily cleared away, and party feeling appears absurdly out of place.

Modern machinery offers to ratepayers a VOTE-FIGHT, but whereas self-management in parishes rarely requires election voting.

Method of  
vestry was  
COMMON  
CONSENT by  
COMMON  
KNOWLEDGE out  
of OPEN  
DISCUSSION.

The records of parochial self-management show that common agreement was its method, and that voting was rarely called for. Voting was then in its natural place, and came last; now, it comes alone, and comes continually, having trampled out everything that is rational in local method.

Local management now arbitrarily conducted and ratepayers excluded from knowledge and control.

Unfortunately, through the combined agency of various disguises, self-action in parish affairs has been gradually taken away from the general body of the ratepayers, and almost the whole local management of affairs is now thrust in a heap upon a few men who, during their term of office, whether as members of urban or of rural sanitary authorities, are practically absolute and irresponsible, and tend to become jealous, arbitrary and secret in their proceedings. Under such conditions, the motives inducing the ratepayers at large to acquire local knowledge do not hold, and their opportunities for acquiring such knowledge have gone, for vestry meetings have lost regard and authority solely in consequence of their being deprived of the powers they formerly enjoyed. The open vestry survives for formal purposes of little importance, or as a vehicle for indignation protests, but it is a husk from which effective life has passed away. The old vestry meetings forced information into light, and parish opinion was formed upon, and corrected by, the general exchange then made of knowledge upon local details.

Old open parish meetings gave inhabitants knowledge of one another, whereas present system stimulates Electioneering manoeuvring, but keeps inhabitants ignorant of one another.

From the want of open vestry meetings of the ratepayers, called periodically and as occasion demanded to consider questions of definite parochial requirement, there is no opportunity to discover the fitness and inclination of individuals to undertake local duties. The old open parish meetings gave the inhabitants knowledge of one another; they then could find out the men with dependable qualities adapted to local business, because the ratepayers met to discuss the actual matters needing management in their parish, and the selection of men to serve upon Committees was made upon their ascertained capacity for carrying out the matters decided upon. At such a time it was but natural that actual personal qualifications for local business should be the first and greatly predominating consideration in making a selection from among the parishioners. But now that the open parish meeting for

parish business has been practically superseded, the inhabitants learn nothing about their local affairs, or in a public aspect about each other, and when an election is to be made they do not know which way to turn. The general local ignorance breeds confusion and indifference, and good candidates cannot be selected, because the meetings which drew the inhabitants together for parish purposes, and thereby led to a proper cultivation and display of parish duties, have been abandoned. Hence it naturally follows, that in local elections little heed is given to the true qualifications for local management, and their weight and right are easily overwhelmed by election manœuvring and the spirit of political contest. How can it be otherwise? The ratepayers have been driven away from the practical understanding of their local business, they have therefore nothing to go upon, and do not feel how absurd it is to choose men for the care of their poor, of their roads, of their health, on the ground of admiration for Lord Salisbury's foreign policy, or zeal for Irish emancipation under Mr. Gladstone. The Local elections of the authorities, indicated as patterns for the construction of Parish Councils, are gradually falling into the routine of the mechanical practices of electioneering, and are utilized for the personal objects of the manipulators or by propagandist partisans of any kind. When the election is over, and the strong sympathies, political or otherwise, which it aroused, find no food and are seen to be out of place, then disgust and impatience lead to neglect of local work, and serious scandals soon arise.

The Ratepayers' Protection Associations which are now springing up in so many places are strangely anomalous bodies to claim their parentage from the working of local representative institutions. These associations seem to be powerless because their organization can accomplish little so long as ratepayers are compelled to sit still for one year or three years while great mischiefs may be proceeding. They may be regarded as a somewhat muddled but rather pathetic protest. The more powerless they are the more decisively do they prove that such a state of things is not local self-government, but a make-believe substitute, which has concealed the loss of the effective control the

Ratepayers' Associations are an anomalous but pathetic protest; they find the LONG FIXED TERM too much for them.

ratepayers formerly possessed, before they had been pushed from that contact with the transaction of their affairs which gave them real knowledge and power about and over them. The present centralization, of course, does not take away from the ratepayers all power of interference, but it takes away from them all their power for exercising an understanding influence upon the course of local management, and wherever the dodging system of fractional election, one-third elected each year, is adopted, the ratepayers' control becomes nearly intangible. In short, at no time are the ratepayers masters of their own affairs.

In a rural Parish no good object can be served by the election of Managers for fixed periods of one year or three years. Where the interest and understanding about local affairs is common to all concerned, there can be no excuse for it. Formerly, if things were going wrong, a meeting of the inhabitants in open vestry assembled was promptly called, and facts and opinions were subjected to discussion—if need were, to repeated discussion. Thus the evidence was fully cleared before any action was taken, and the ratepayers were masters of their affairs because they possessed the power of grappling at once with any mischief by taking control into their own hands and making arrangements adapted to the emergency. *If management be good, the ratepayers appreciate it, and in instruction travel with it; if it be bad, for what reason are the ratepayers kept helpless until the time has passed by when their interference would have been effectual to protect their interests?* Their interference promptly applied would be reasoning and probably adequate, whereas forced inaction produces exasperation, a vindictive party spirit and tumultuous impatience at election times.

To make local  
managers  
**IRREMOVABLE**  
FOR FIXED  
PERIODS  
would be  
disastrous  
innovation  
inexcusable in  
rural Parishes.

**IRREMOVABLE**  
FIXED PERIODS  
leave ratepayers  
with no power to  
protect them-  
selves, and in  
injurious irrita-  
tion against  
their local  
authority.

The ratepayers have now no clear means for influencing the Local Management which is going on under their own eyes, and is of vital moment to them. If they had the power over their affairs which they ought to possess, the consciousness of it would nourish mutual understanding and mutual responsibility between the ratepayers and the managers they had selected; *interference would come in time to avert evils*, and would take shape in clearance of fact and

reasonable explanations between the parties ; irritated feelings on both sides would subside, and the need felt by ratepayers and managers for a common understanding about parish work, would give the strongest attainable guarantee for a moderate and continuous policy, and for protection against any sudden and violent changes. As things are, the fact that the ratepayers have no power which they can exert in time to protect themselves, keeps ratepayers and managers apart. A bad spirit grows up on both sides, and the pent-up impatience and irritation of the electors finds vent on the election day in a determination to have a complete turn out, and a total reversal of the previous policy.

Suppose the managers of public institutions or the directors of industrial or commercial enterprises were made secure from any interference for a long fixed term, how could business of trust be carried on ? All would exclaim against the unendurable danger and absurdity of it. If we try to imagine how Parliament would find itself with FIXED PERIOD MINISTERS, the very idea appears intolerable and absurd, and would be scouted as destroying at once control and responsibility, because it clearly carries administration out of reach. Still, the consultative relation of Parliament to the Executive Government and that of the inhabitants to their Parish Executive can be compared, because the inhabitants have a day-to-day sight and understanding of their local affairs. General experience contributes to the conclusion that *changes in representative management are really far less frequently desired and much more moderate in their character if the tenure of power is dependent upon consent and approval by the constituent body.* If parish authorities were elected to act during consent of the inhabitants, there would be far fewer elections altogether and greater general satisfaction. The reciprocal responsibility of the electors and the elected would be kept fully alive, and the ratepayers would have the tranquilizing certainty that they could always intervene, if circumstances required them to do so, for the advantage and protection of the parish.

Urban conditions differ entirely from those which prevail in rural parts where the population is thin, and

IRREMOVABLE  
FOR FIXED  
PERIOD PARISH

COUNCILS  
would displace  
open delibera-  
tion by secrecy  
and intrigue.

has strong local ties, and the inhabitants are connected by their conditions of livelihood. If the inhabitants all had an equal and direct voice in local matters a salutary public feeling, which would benefit all classes and much improve their mutual relations to each other, would be infused into rural life. The change would speedily and enormously improve the livelihood and prospects of the peasantry, because the discussion of practical parish matters in open village assembly not only is an education in itself, but would force their new power of independent management into line with the necessities and various responsibilities which accompany it. In the almost domestic circumstances of a rural parish, election for a long fixed period would be especially mischievous. Power conferred upon a parish council, as an authority above, and independent of the inhabitants, would even in one year do much to create secrecy and corrupt practices in parish management. In short the habits of open parish deliberation would give place to nauseous conspiracies for seizing power and keeping it.

IRREMOVABLE  
FOR FIXED  
PERIOD PARISH  
COUNCIL  
would create  
petty tyranny in  
the Parish, and  
provide effective  
implement for  
carrying out  
extreme  
centralization.

The members of such a fixed term parish council, from the circumstance that their position vests in them a very arbitrary authority, must appear to, or may in fact, become petty tyrants in their parish. They cannot, however, avoid working as quite obedient instruments under direction from the central bureau for local management in London.

Masked under various shapes and getting foothold upon many specious pretences, two main features are nearly always apparent in a product of centralizing legislation.

**FIRSTLY.**—A local authority is created in order to take away the powers of practical interference resting in the hands of the inhabitants.

**SECONDLY.**—The local authority so created and equipped is placed completely under the thumb of the Central Department.

*Thus a rural local authority is used by centralization first as a cat's paw to obtain power, and afterwards as a cover to conceal*

---

*centralized control, and to screen it from responsibility.* It is this calculated process which may enable "the art and trick of despots," under disguises of popular titles and pretences, to establish itself widely without exciting the suspicion which more open attempts would be sure to arouse. There is almost the certainty that an irremovable-for-fixed-period parish council would rapidly develop the most offensive vices of a small official tyranny. To centralization this sort of village council offers a convenient tool. Towards the parish it would prove an irritating and overbearing despotism. The accustomed rights of open village action would be superseded by it, and country life would be permeated by a vexatiously obstructive officialism, constantly inviting corruption as a practical palliative.

---

## PART II.

## CONCERNING DEPARTMENTS OF LOCAL MANAGEMENT.

*Chapter I.—The Parish and Poor Relief.**Division I.—The Existing Assumptions are Baseless.*

Independent  
Parish  
Management of  
Poor has been  
the most suc-  
cessful.

It is in connection with poor relief administration that the gravest charges against parish management have been persistently brought. If a careful examination into the past can demonstrate that these charges are based upon misconceptions, it becomes important to enquire why it is that so much prejudice against parish management has arisen and has maintained its hold. *The history of poor relief administration makes it clear that parish management, before it was tampered with, had almost extirpated pauperism, and that no other description of management has had or is ever likely to have a success at all approaching to it.* Why, therefore, is this great lesson from poor relief in the past so misunderstood and misrepresented?

Central  
Departments  
instinctively  
labour against  
decentralization  
of control.

Unfortunately for the liberties which it protects and which arise out of decentralization, especially from the decentralization of control, the State departments are instinctively opposed to it. The purposes, ambitions and employments connected, or hopeful of connection, with centralized Local Government appear to be brought under question, and seem in jeopardy from proposals for decentralization. A very large number of persons are employed in the Civil Departments of the State. In many aspects, as between the State and the people, the Civil Service

resembles a small army, and it is animated with a zeal and *esprit de corps* as active and compact as are evinced by our great naval and military organizations. The officials of a central department must be expected to resist anything which narrows the range or limits the force of their authority even if it does not directly withdraw any of their powers. Self-preservation is a first law with official as with ordinary human nature, and the permanent staff of a department will not voluntarily part with power. On the contrary they seek to evade the loss of it with all the ingenuity which clever and resourceful men can employ when acting under an instinct allied to that of self-defence. Thus, while the hostility to decentralization can securely depend upon an abundance of watchful shrewdness and determination, its advocacy is lacking in the concentration derived from personal motives.

Our poor relief system connects together imperial and local responsibility much more closely than anything else, and the state of extreme alarm which was produced in the first quarter of the century by the breakdown of poor relief is still quite fresh in the general mind. Those who favour centralization are well aware that so long as responsibility for the breakdown of the old poor relief system can be fastened upon parish administration, the claims of parishes to a restoration of powers of self-management can be safely disregarded. Poor relief, both in the history of its powers and in its administration, is not an easily accessible subject, and its complication and obscurity allow much opportunity for misrepresentation and for the vehement denunciations which usually greet any proposal for local independence in parishes. If a centralizing proposal wants a lift it generally utilizes the breakdown of poor relief administration, treating it as an admitted default of parish management. The Sanitary Commissioners of 1871 use it in this way, and constantly lean upon it throughout their Report. For instance, they say in their observations upon the "Scheme of Local Government in England,"\*

Charge against  
Vestry  
management of  
poor flatly  
opposed to facts.

\* Second Report of the Royal Sanitary Commission, 1871, Vol. I., page 19.

"Groups of parishes have since 1834 been united for the management of poor relief which had become so misconducted by vestries as "to render a change in the law imperative."

Doctrinaires and the promoters of novelties, especially sanitary ones, are always wanting the authority of a central department as a convenient repository for wide general powers to overrule the resistance and the economical misgivings of ratepayers; hence they are always among the foremost in helter-skelter condemnation of "the misconduct and incapacity of vestries." *The facts, however, are entirely the other way; there was no misconduct or incapacity in the independent open vestry management of poor relief. The misconduct and incapacity first appeared when vestries began to be superseded in their management of poor relief, and they increased in proportion to the progressive steps by which vestries were deprived of all power to act in freedom upon their local knowledge and judgment.*

Parish administration gave promise of extirpating Pauperism.

The late Professor Fawcett, in his manual of Political Economy,\* summarizes the results produced by the Act passed in the 43rd of Elizabeth, which made the overseers of parishes responsible for the collection of rates and the administration of poor relief. He gives a general view of the rise and fall of this important burden from 1600 to 1834, which from its compact clearness it is convenient to quote:—

"There is so little difference in all important principles between "these provisions and those which were embodied in the New Poor "Law of 1834, that it may at first sight seem difficult to understand "why this latter Act was ever required. There probably never "would have been any necessity for passing it had not the Poor Law "of Elizabeth been most mischievously tampered with.

"It is obvious from the description just given of its leading provisions that one of the chief objects of its framers was to deal "vigorously with voluntary pauperism. For 150 years this policy "was continued with the happiest results. Mendicancy and vagrancy "greatly diminished, and the restrictions imposed upon able-bodied "paupers were regarded by them as so onerous that few, except the "impotent poor, applied for relief. Between the passing of the Act "in 1601 and the time to which we refer, several amending statutes "were passed, none of these, however, weakened, some of them "materially strengthened, the original purpose of the Act. Thus, in "1723, the ninth year of the reign of George I., a parish, or union of "parishes, was empowered to build a workhouse, and the offer of resi-

\* Book IV., Chap. V., page 579.

"dence in it if not accepted was a bar against relief. This enabled local authorities to diminish, or even altogether to abolish, out-door relief. There is reason to believe that if the power thus conferred on local authorities had been more extensively taken advantage of, a vast proportion of the pauperism which has afflicted this country would never have existed. But, unfortunately, an entirely different policy was soon adopted by Parliament, and sanctioned by public opinion. It seems not improbable that this change of policy is to a great extent to be attributed to the remarkable influence exercised by the Elizabethan Poor Law in diminishing pauperism. Frequent reference is made by writers of the period to the fact that about the middle of the last century there was less pauperism in England than in any other country. It appeared at that time not unlikely that pauperism would, in the course of a few years, be almost exterminated. Unfortunately, however, instead of persevering in a policy which had produced such happy results, the opinion began to prevail that, as there were comparatively so little pauperism, there would be no danger in administering parochial relief in what was supposed to be a more liberal and kind-hearted spirit. The stringent provisions of the Elizabethan Poor Law were gradually relinquished; out-door relief instead of being discouraged was directly fostered by various Acts of Parliament; a lax administration of the law became general, and the result was that pauperism assumed such alarming proportions about the year 1832 as almost to threaten the country with national bankruptcy and permanent ruin."

It is, however, entirely an error to suppose that "there is so little difference in all important principles between these provisions and those which were embodied in the New Poor Law of 1834." On the contrary, there is an enormous difference from most points of view. By the 43rd Elizabeth and some succeeding Acts, parishes were made *the local areas for relief, and the overseers* the authority for the giving of relief. The 43rd Elizabeth prescribed a practice for the administration of relief which could have had no other object than to encourage the ratepayers to act with the overseers, and subsequently, as will be seen, the ratepayers themselves were made the authority for the giving of relief. Under the New Poor Law a state of things most widely opposed to that which prevailed under the law of Elizabeth has been established. Instead of the parish itself, union areas, which on an average are forty times larger than a parish, have been constituted, and instead of the inhabitants acting by and for themselves, boards of guardians greatly removed from influence by the inhabitants have been made the authority, and they act in most complete subordination to a central

43rd Elizabeth  
and New Poor  
Law of 1834  
compared.

department. *In a comparison of results, the Victorian law ought to be able to show to much advantage, for it has enjoyed a far better time.* During the 150 years from the 43rd of Elizabeth we had many periods of wars and revolutions with bad monarchs. During the past 50 years of the New Poor Law we have had, under one great constitutional monarch, wide prosperity, a stupendous development of commerce and manufactures, and the novel element of so much colonial absorption of our poor that the present modified centralization can scarcely be said to have had opportunity to fail. *Nevertheless, compared with the Elizabethan law, the Victorian law is an administrative failure.*

State of country  
immediately  
before passing  
of 43rd  
Elizabeth.

Professor Fawcett's assertion "that it appeared likely that pauperism would soon be exterminated," owing, as he writes, "to the remarkable influence exercised by "the Elizabethan Poor Law in diminishing it," is amply established by much general evidence, as well as by the contemporary writers who allude to the fact that "about "the middle of the last century there was less pauperism "in England than in any other country." Strype, in his "Annals," published in 1724, makes some allusion to the general state of the poor; he does not enter into the question of administration of poor relief, but in Vol. IV., page 290, he quotes the statement of an eminent J.P. in Somersetshire in 1596, five years before the Act of 43rd Elizabeth, which is valuable because it presents a picture of the desperate condition which prevailed in the country a few years before responsibility and powers of self-management were imposed upon parishes by that statute.

"In enumerating the disorders which then prevailed in that county the author informs us that 40 persons had there been "executed in a year for robberies, thefts, and other felonies, 35 burnt "in the hand, 37 whipped, 183 discharged; that those who were "discharged were most wicked and desperate persons, who never could "come to any good because they would not work and none would "take them into service; that, notwithstanding these great number "of indictments, the fifth part of the felonies committed in the county "were not brought to trial, and the greater number escaped censure "either from the superior cunning of the felons, the remissness of the "magistrates, or the foolish lenity of the people; that the rapines "committed by the infinite number of wicked, wandering, idle people "were intolerable to the poor countrymen, and obliged them to a

“ continual watch of their sheepfolds, pastures, woods, and cornfields ; “ that the other counties of England were in no better condition, and “ many of them were even in a worse ; that there were at least 300 or “ 400 able bodied vagabonds in every county who lived by theft and “ rapine, and who sometimes met in troops to the number of 60 and “ committed spoil on the inhabitants, and that the magistrates were “ awed by the association and by threats of confederates from execut- “ ing justice on the offenders.”

Again, Dr. Burn published in 1764 a book entitled “ History of the Poor Laws.” It deals also with their administration, and the writer has detailed in a very interesting manner various proposals made in his own time and before it for amending the poor laws, or for dealing independently with the difficulties of pauperism. He says, page 104 :—

“ The first thing clearly observable from what has been laid down “ is this—that the statute of the 43rd Elizabeth was not the first com- “ pulsive law for maintenance of the poor. It hath been generally “ supposed that the said statute established an entirely new plan, and “ from the known abilities of Cecil and Walsingham, and other great “ men of that age, arguments have been framed in favour of the excel- “ lence of their scheme, and of the difficulty of amending the same or “ proposing a better. It is confessedly difficult to do so, as appears “ in that the wisdom and experience of succeeding ages for near 200 “ years have not been able to effect it. That statute was not a sudden, “ unpremeditated project, but had been the work of ages before, “ dictated by necessity and experience.”

Sir Frederick Eden, in 1797, in his work “ The State of the Poor,” refers to the fact that little information, except what can be extracted from pamphlets, can be obtained. He states the poor rate in England and Wales in 1689 to have been £665,362. In 1750 it was £689,000, showing that, notwithstanding increase of population, the charge for the poor had scarcely increased under parish administration.

In *The King against the Inhabitants of Leigh*, reported in Durnford and East's Term Reports (vol. 3, p. 748, 29 & 30 Geo. III., 1789-90), the subject matter of which was an attempt by a large parish to make a small parish within it contribute to its poor rate, the judges of the King's Bench confirmed the Order of Sessions quashing the rate. In giving judgment Lord Kenyon, Chief Justice, said :—

Charge for the  
Poor did not  
increase under  
management by  
Parishes.

Important  
judicial opinion  
in 1790 preferr-  
ing small  
districts on  
ground of their  
better provision  
for the poor.

“ It has been doubted by county gentlemen whether the poor are “ better maintained in large or small districts, though the former has “ been said officially in this court. In small divisions the officers are “ more attentive to their duties, and in the part of the country with “ which I am acquainted the poor are better provided for in the small “ districts. Therefore as the usage in this case coincides with our “ ideas on the policy, and as we are warranted by the adjudged cases “ on the point, we think it highly proper that the divisions of this “ parish which has subsisted so long should continue, and consequently “ that the Order of Sessions should be affirmed.”

Mr. Justice Buller, who followed the Lord Chief Justice, in giving judgment, said :—

“ I entirely agree with my Lord Chief Justice that the greater “ care is taken of the poor in small than in large districts.”

Mr. Justice Grose, in his judgment, said :—

“ If I were to give my own opinion of the policy of the law I “ should not hesitate to say that, from my own experience, I have “ found that the poor are better provided for in small than in large “ districts.”

The instinctive inclination of officials for large districts appears thus early to have manifested itself, but the refutation of Lord Chief Justice Kenyon puts it aside, and his emphatic preference for small districts, in which Mr. Justice Buller and Mr. Justice Grose so decidedly concurred, deserves careful consideration. In holding assizes over the country they had opportunities for most extensive observation, and evidence about vagrancy and the poor continually before them. Their opinion, expressed as it was in open Court, in favour of small districts, as making better provision for the poor than large districts, is entitled to great weight.

**Individual care  
required to cure  
pauperism.**

In the 13th edition of his “ Commentaries,” published in 1800, Sir W. Blackstone says :—\*

“ The number of indigent persons being greatly increased by with- “ drawing the alms of the monasteries, a plan was formed in the reign “ of Queen Elizabeth more humane and beneficial than even feeding “ and clothing of millions, by affording them the means (with proper “ industry) to feed and clothe themselves. And the farther any subse- “ quent plans for maintaining the poor have departed from this “ institution, the more impracticable and even pernicious their “ visionary attempts have proved.”

\* Book IV., p. 432.

All experience down to our own day confirms Sir W. Blackstone's opinion. Pauperism is a disease which requires comparative isolation and individual treatment; if paupers are herded together in large numbers their cure is hopeless.

---

---

## PART II.

### *Chapter I.—The Parish and Poor Relief.*

---

#### *Division II.—Centralizing Aggressions Caused the Breakdown of Poor Relief Management.*

---

It is not necessary to go behind the 43rd Elizabeth, as the previous legislation of the 14th and 39th Elizabeth was incorporated with it; but a careful review of the whole course of legislation from the end of Elizabeth's reign down to the commencement of the reign of Victoria, is necessary in order to expose the true causes of failure in poor law administration prior to 1834, and to place the responsibility for that failure upon the many legislative changes and upon the administration *which really produced it.*

By the 43rd Elizabeth, the churchwardens with the overseers, appointed under the hand and seal of two or more justices, were empowered to set the poor to work and to tax the inhabitants for their relief. For these purposes the churchwardens and the overseers were directed to meet together at the least once in every month. Though no mention is made of the inhabitants, it is certain that the inhabitants were intended to participate;

By 43rd  
Elizabeth,  
provision for the  
poor was made  
in the parish  
church upon  
Sunday, after  
divine service.

indeed this conclusion follows as a necessary consequence from the direction of the Act according to the words of the second section—"shall meet together at the least once "in every month in the church of the said parish, upon the "Sunday in the afternoon, after divine service, there to "consider of some good course to be taken." The place assigned by the Act for meeting (the parish church of the parishioners) and the time of meeting, also assigned by the Act (after afternoon service), put beyond doubt the fact that the inhabitants did take part in considering "the "good course to be taken" in the "interest of the parish "for the relief of its poor." There is ample evidence that it was the custom of the parishioners to join with the churchwardens and overseers in their deliberations, and that the purpose of the framers of the Act IN REQUIRING THE PARISH OFFICERS TO MEET IN A PUBLIC PLACE, THE PARISH CHURCH, OPEN TO ALL, AND AT A TIME (AFTER DIVINE SERVICE) WHEN ALL THE PARISHIONERS WOULD BE ASSEMBLED TOGETHER AND HAVE LEISURE, was secured. The object of this wise law obviously was to prevent anything corrupt or secret being done, and to give knowledge and influence to the inhabitants in the conduct of their affairs. Probably in those respects no modern practice is of equal efficiency. For a period of 90 years this great Act of Elizabeth, confiding in the necessary knowledge of the people in regard to their local affairs, and in their good sense and faculty to do their best, remained the sole authority and direction afforded by the law for poor relief administration.

13th and 14th.  
Car. II.,  
Chapter 12.  
throws light  
upon actual  
working.

The Act passed in the reign of Charles the Second provided more specially for the settlement of the poor in their parishes. This Act throws light also upon what the practice had been, as it incidentally, and not by any provision or section expressly for the purpose, gives the power to make rates "to churchwardens and overseers of the poor "and other inhabitants of the said parish."

3rd William and  
Mary,  
Chapter II.,  
prescribed that  
THE INHABI-  
TANTS SHOULD  
MEET AS OFTEN  
AS CONVENIENT.

The next Act is the 3rd William and Mary, entitled "An Act for the better Explanation and Supplying the "Defects of the Former Laws for the Settlement of the "Poor." From this statute it appears that inconveniences had in some cases arisen from want of sufficient control by

the inhabitants over their parish officers, the church-  
wardens and overseers, and the Act consequently by  
section 11 proceeds to give authority to the inhabitants  
themselves entirely without reserve or restriction. It is  
necessary to quote the wording of this section in order  
to appreciate the position created by it:—

“ And whereas many inconveniences do daily arise in cities, towns  
“ corporate, and parishes, *where the inhabitants are very numerous*, by  
“ reason of the unlimited power of the churchwardens and overseers  
“ of the poor, who do frequently upon frivolous pretences (but chiefly  
“ for their own private ends) give relief to what persons and number  
“ they think fit, and such persons being entered into the collection  
“ bill, do come after that a great charge to the parish, notwithstanding-  
“ ing the occasion or pretence of their receiving collection oftentimes  
“ ceases, by which means the rates for the poor are daily increased,  
“ contrary to the true intent of a statute made in the forty-third year  
“ of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, entitled ‘An Act for  
“ ‘the Relief of the Poor’ ; for remedying of which, and preventing  
“ the like abuses for the future, be it further enacted, That there  
“ shall be provided and kept in every parish (at the charge of the  
“ same parish) a book or books, wherein the names of all such persons  
“ who do or may receive collection shall be registered, with the day  
“ and year when they were first admitted to have relief, and the occa-  
“ sion which brought them under that necessity: and that yearly in  
“ Easter week (OR AS OFTEN AS IT SHALL BE THOUGHT CONVENIENT),  
“ the parishioners of every parish shall meet in their vestry or other  
“ usual place of meeting in the same parish, before whom the said  
“ book shall be produced, and all persons receiving collection to be  
“ called over, and the reasons of their taking relief examined, and a  
“ new list made and entered, of such persons as they shall think fit  
“ and allow to receive collection, and that no other person be allowed  
“ to have or receive collection at the charge of the said parish, but by  
“ authority under the hand of one justice of peace residing within  
“ such parish, or (if none be there dwelling) in the parts near or next  
“ adjoining, or by order of the justices in their respective quarter  
“ sessions, except in cases of pestilential diseases.”

With regard to the extraordinary power given to a justice under this statute the Poor Law Commissioners of 1834 make the following comment:—

Power given to a justice irrelevant and probably unintentional.

\* “ If the framers of the Act had intended to make in the law the enormous change which these few words, ‘but by the authority under ‘the hand of one justice,’ effected, if they had intended to vest in a single justice not necessarily resident within the parish, or acquainted with its concerns, the power to order the overseer to distribute, as ‘the justice might think fit, the property of the ratepayers, it can

“ scarcely be supposed that they would have introduced an enactment  
“ of such importance by way of exception at the end of a clause, or  
“ prefixed to it so irrelevant a preamble.”

It seems clear that the Commissioners must be right in supposing that no importance was attached to the power given to a justice by the 3rd of William and Mary. Perhaps it originated in some jealousy at such unreserved powers being given to the inhabitants. It is quite plain from the wording of the section that the control was given to the parishioners as a *remedial* control to correct abuses and mal-administration by churchwardens and overseers. The management had been in some sort a joint management of parish officers acting for and with the inhabitants. The experience, however, of 90 years prompted legislation by which the parish officers were placed in complete subordination to the inhabitants.

The Poor Law Commissioners by a singular inadvertence incorrectly quote the section, and *as a working direction make nonsense of it*. In their report of 1834 it runs\*—“and that yearly in Easter week the parishioners “ shall meet in vestry,” the words of the section if correctly quoted are “and that yearly in Easter week (*or* “ *as often as it shall be thought convenient*) the parishioners “ of every parish shall meet in their vestry.” Of what use would it have been for the inhabitants to meet yearly in Easter week in order themselves to discharge the duties of poor relief administration under the powers conveyed to them by the Act? To call over the persons receiving collection, to examine the reasons for their taking relief, and to make out a list of such persons as they (the inhabitants) shall think fit and allow to receive collection were *details* of administration requiring *continually* to be performed. Of course a meeting for such duties *once yearly* would have been absurd. The Act by the words “*and as often as it shall be thought convenient*” gave full power to the inhabitants who, in fact, did assemble in vestry NOT ONCE A YEAR, *but frequently, in some parishes 15 to 30 times in the year*. The omission of these most important words of the section prevents the readers of the Poor Law Report from understanding the *extent to which adminis-*

Poor Law  
Commissioners  
in their  
quotation omit  
words “OR AS  
“ OFTEN AS IT  
“ SHALL BE  
“ THOUGHT  
“ CONVENIENT,”  
a power essential  
to the working  
of the 3rd and  
4th William and  
Mary.

*tration was committed to the inhabitants by the 3rd and 4th William and Mary.* Under this Act the control by the inhabitants of parishes and their allowance of poor relief was most detailed and complete. They were entirely independent, with power to act upon their own knowledge and judgment without any check or restraint from outside. *Thus the Parochial Administration of Poor Relief received its most absolute expression as a remedial reform under the provisions of section 11 of 3rd and 4th William and Mary.* In order, however, to properly appreciate the working of this unreserved decentralization in local management, it is essential to keep in mind the words omitted by the Poor Law Commissioners in their quotation of the section. *The omission of these important words—“or as often as it shall be thought convenient” — has probably been the cause of extensive misconception.*

Not until after an interval of 21 years from the time when the administration of poor relief had by the 3rd and 4th William and Mary been unreservedly placed in the hands of the inhabitants in vestry assembled, was any fresh interference with the authority for the administration of poor relief sanctioned by Parliament. The interference then initiated was not an interference with vestry management. *Nothing in the past administration had provoked Parliament to any limitation of the authority of the inhabitants.*

The Poor Law Commissioners say:—\*

“The engagements of the 43rd Elizabeth were perhaps dangerous “engagements, but they were engagements which for 100 years were “performed apparently without substantial injury to the morals and “industry of the labourers or to the general prosperity of the “country.”

The facts of the case most clearly show that this great result of successful administration for more than 100 years was attained during the period of parochial administration and while it was further developing under the progressive steps of decentralization established by the Acts of Parliament following the 43rd Elizabeth. No evidence can be more complete or of higher authority than that afforded by the course of legislation over so long a period. It

Evidence of  
Poor Law Com-  
missioners  
affirms that  
parish manage-  
ment under  
utmost  
decentralization  
gave 100 years of  
successful  
administration.

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report of 1834, page 78.

attests the general concurrence in establishing decentralizing methods, and the appreciation set upon direct self-management as a practical check upon ignorant administration and corruption by the general body of the inhabitants.

**S and 9 William III., Chapter 30.** The next Act, 8th and 9th William III., Chap. 30, deals with some provisions affecting settlement, and provides by section 11 that persons receiving relief shall wear the badge of a large Roman P, together with the name of the parish or place whereof such poor person is an inhabitant. It does not otherwise interfere with authority for administration.

**For 110 years legislature never intervened except to enlarge control of inhabitants.** Up to this time—a period of 110 years—the management of poor law relief had been but little interfered with from outside. On the contrary, the vestry management upon each intervention by the legislature had received *a fuller and more complete expansion of power and administration to be directly exercised by the inhabitants within their parishes.* Thus the 13th and 14th Charles II. gave a further recognition than the 43rd Elizabeth, and the 3rd and 4th William and Mary gave to the inhabitants the utmost conceivable power for direct management.

**Act of 9 George I., though passed to remedy mischiefs arising from powers given to justices, and intended to increase parish powers, unintentionally became first step towards disorganization and overthrow of parochial self-Government.** When Parliament next intervened it was to remedy mischiefs arising from the power given to justices which, according to the Poor Law Commissioners' Report, appears to have inadvertently slipped into the Act of 3rd and 4th William and Mary. The new law, the 9th George I., was passed to limit the power of justices. *It did this by taking away their power to give relief, not only until application had been made to parishioners and overseers and refused, but also until the overseers had been heard upon the reasons why relief had been refused.* In short the Act was intended to consolidate administration by the inhabitants, and to restrict the justices to judicial functions only in connection with poor relief.

The 9th George I., Chapter 7, by its preamble, says:—

"AND WHEREAS, UNDER COLOUR OF THE PROVISO IN THE SAID ACT, MANY PERSONS HAVE APPLIED TO SOME JUSTICES OF PEACE, WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE OF ANY OFFICERS OF THE PARISH, OR THEREBY UPON UNTRUE SUGGESTIONS, AND SOMETIMES UPON FALSE OR FRIVOLOUS PRETENCES, HAVE OBTAINED RELIEF, WHICH HATH

"GREATLY CONTRIBUTED TO THE INCREASE OF THE PARISH RATES  
"FOR REMEDY WHEREOF BE IT ENACTED, that no justice of peace  
"shall order relief to any poor person dwelling in any parish until  
"oath be made before such justice of some matter which he shall  
"judge to be a reasonable cause or ground for having such relief, and that  
"the same person had by himself, herself, or some other, applied for  
"relief to the parishioners of the parish, at some vestry or other  
"public meeting of the said parishioners, or to two of the overseers  
"of the poor of such parish, and was by them refused to be relieved,  
"and until such justice hath summoned two of the overseers of the  
"poor to show cause why such relief should not be given, and the  
"person so summoned hath been heard or made default to appear  
"before such justice, anything in the first proviso or any law to the  
"contrary notwithstanding."

The Act of 9 George I. provided a remedy for the abuses arising from *magisterial management*, and it expressed satisfaction with the results of management as exercised by the inhabitants in the most practical way possible—by consolidating their authority. The Act is plainly innocent of any intention to inconvenience or fetter the inhabitants in their poor administration. It took away from justices their direct power to order relief and required their compliance with a prescribed method of enquiry as a condition precedent to their ordering relief. For the purpose of this enquiry a justice had power to summon overseers before him to show cause why relief had not been given. *It was the working of this provision that provided a root for the continuous growth of centralizing aggressions.* The vexatious waste of time with the personal losses resulting from it, and the general irritation produced by the reference on appeal to the justices harassed vestries and overseers so much in their administration that parish duties and offices gradually sank in estimation, and parishioners of position and ability refused to serve. **TUH THE VESTRY WAS DEPRIVED OF NATURAL ELEMENTS OF STRENGTH AND OF IMPORTANT SAFEGUARDS FOR A PURE AND RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF LOCAL AFFAIRS.** With the passing of the 9th George I. *the responsible parochial administration of poor relief must be considered to have received a serious blow.* The Act, however, only slowly permeated the practice of local administration, but, wherever, and in so far as it did so, it broke down parish management by the unendurable hardship and humiliation it imposed upon the inhabitants and the parish officers.

From this period (1713) the action of the inhabitants was exposed to fatally disruptive influences arising from magisterial interference. Such interference by the magistrates was necessarily disruptive, because they rarely possessed an intimate local interest in or knowledge of the serious duties assigned to them. In their report the Poor Law Commissioners of 1834 are explicit upon this point:—\*

“The history of the poor laws abounds with instances of a legislation which has been worse than unsuccessful, which has not merely failed in effecting its purposes, but has been active in producing effects which were directly opposed to them; has created whatever it was intended to prevent, and fostered whatever it was intended to discourage. Thus, the 3 & 4 Will. & Mary, which was passed to check the profusion of overseers, to enable the parishioners to decide whom they should think fit and allow to receive relief, was construed as authorizing the justices to order relief to those who applied to them without the knowledge of the parish officers; and the Act, which was passed to remedy this abuse, enabled the justice, on the pauper’s statement of some matter which the justice should judge to be a reasonable cause or ground for relief, to summon the overseers to show cause why relief should not be given, and to order such relief as he should think fit. An order against which there is no appeal.”

There appears some contradiction in taking away from justices their power to order relief in consequence of the abuses to which it had given rise and at the same time allowing them, upon appeal by a pauper, to upset a parish decision, but it should be observed that *the first power was administrative, while the second was purely judicial*. It was an unfortunate change, and inevitably introduced confusion into parish management, and undermined all its responsibility. There is no conflict of opinion upon this point. The Act to which the Commissioners refer is the 9th George I., and they say that such interference with administration is calculated to destroy all vigilance and economy on the part of those who administer relief. The statement in the Commissioners’ Report is clear and sufficient:—†

“The overseer is summoned, perhaps, six or seven miles from his business, or his farm, to defend himself before the tribunal of his immediate superiors against a charge of avarice or cruelty. He seldom has any opportunity to support his defence by evidence: the pleadings generally consist of the pauper’s assertions on the one side, and

\* Poor Law Commissioners’ First Report, 1834, page 74.

+ Poor Law Commissioners’ First Report, 1834, pages 80, 81.

How destructive degradation of parish responsibility and management was brought about.

"the overseer's on the other. The magistrate may admit or reject the evidence of either party at his pleasure; may humiliate the overseer "in the pauper's presence with whatever reproof he may think that "his frugality deserves, and finally pronounce a decree, against "which, however unsupported by the facts of the case or mischievous "in principle, there is no appeal. It must be remembered, too, that "the pauper has often the choice of his tribunal. The clause of the "3 & 4 William & Mary, c. 11, which confined the jurisdiction to "a justice of the peace residing within the parish, or, if none be there "dwelling, in the parts near or next adjoining, was disregarded at the "unfortunate period to which we have referred. The 36 George III. "c. 23, gives its discretionary powers to any of His Majesty's justice "or justices of the peace for any county, city, town, or place, usually "acting in or for the district wherein the same shall be situated. And "though the 59 George III. c. 12, s. 5, has required the concurrence "of two justices to an order for relief, yet this restriction, as is the "case with many other wisely intended clauses in the Act, is "neutralized by a proviso enabling one justice to make an order in "case of emergency, an emergency of which he is the judge. All the "overseers of a district are therefore at the mercy of any two "magistrates, and to a considerable degree at the mercy of any one. "The pauper may select those magistrates whom misdirected "benevolence, or desire of popularity, or timidity, leads to be profuse "distributors of other people's property, and bring forward his "charges against the overseer, secure of obtaining a verdict. He "appears in the character of an injured man dragging his oppressor "to justice. If he fails he loses nothing, if he succeeds he obtains "triumph and reward. And yet we find persons expressing grave "regret that the parochial fund is wasted, that relief is claimed "as a right, and that pauperism has ceased to be disgraceful. "The subject of regret is, either that the existing system is "suffered to continue, or that such is the constitution of human "nature that a vigilant administration of public money is not to be "expected from those on whom we have heaped every motive to "extravagance and every obstacle against economy; that what the "magistrate awards is considered a right, and that the exercise of an "acknowledged right is not felt a degradation."

The Commissioners also present evidence upon the practical effects of interference by the magistrates. Their arbitrary powers and their over-ruling of vestries and overseers produced a general dislocation in the parish management of the poor. As the functions of vestry and overseers lost independence they necessarily sank in estimation; persons of respectability ceased to attend vestry and avoided serving as overseers. This appears from the evidence, quoted by the Report:—\*

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page S5.

“ In the case of appeals to individual magistrates, says Captain Chapman, I found that the usual course of proceeding was to send the applicant back with a note to the overseer, desiring that the matter might be inquired into, and, if not satisfactorily arranged, that both parties would attend at the house of the magistrate at a time named.

“ This, the most mild mode of exercising the power vested in the magistrates, was open to the objections of being influenced by the peculiar views of each individual, of reducing the inquiry into a statement on the part of the pauper, and a counter statement on the part of the overseer, and of thus tending to render the decision of the vestry of no avail. The result of this course was generally conclusive, so that instances of summonses were very rare.

“ In the cases which were brought before the petty sessions which I attended, great pains were taken by the magistrates to get at the truth; but here again the question degenerated into a statement and counter statement, unsupported by any evidence or documents, so that the bench, with every desire to do justice, had not the power to do so. The leaning in the spectators was decidedly in favour of the pauper; the magistrates considered themselves as the protectors of the poor, and whatever were the demerits or merits of the case, that they were equally bound to prevent the parties from starving; the overseers were looked upon as almost devoid of the feelings of humanity, and the tendency was still more decidedly to render the decisions of the vestry of no avail. Every appeal gained by the pauper was looked upon as a triumph over the overseers and vestry, and this feeling, in some cases, was participated in by the labouring classes in general. At St. Petherton, near Taunton, for instance, I was informed that on a recent occasion a pauper, who had gained his point, returned throwing his hat into the air, hurraying and cheering, and that he was joined by many others, who conducted him in triumph to his home; but cases in which this feeling was so decidedly expressed are, I believe, of rare occurrence, although its existence was universally complained of by the overseers.

“ The effect upon the vestries, I was led to believe, was to cause many respectable persons to refrain from attending, and to have even caused many select vestries to have given up; the members leaving the overseers to ‘ fight it out with the pauper and the magistrates.’ ”

\* “ Mr. Majendie states that in his district,—

“ The opinion of many of the most experienced magistrates themselves coincides with that expressed by occupiers and overseers, that the over-liberality of magistrates in granting relief has been a principal cause of the high rates, and of the dependence of labourers in the parish. In many instances they have adopted a dictatorial tone to the parish overseers, which has induced men of

"respectability to avoid the office ; and when harsh observations have been made in presence of the pauper, the authority of the officer is destroyed."

From the evidence of Mr. Power, another assistant commissioner, it may be seen how natural and reasonable it was for capable and conscientious persons to shun responsibility for any parochial duty. Conditions so intolerably degrading must have had that effect :—\*

"Coming into office this year, Mr. Robinson found 12 married men "on the box, some of the best men in the parish ; he knew they could "get work if they chose at that time ; he set them to work digging a "piece of land of his own at 3d. a rod ; they earned that week only about "7s. 6d. each, though they might have earned 12s. ; and the next "week they disappeared to a man. He complains bitterly of the ob- "struction given to these exertions by the decisions of the magistrates ; "they are always against him, and he regrets some unpleasant words "spoken to him very lately by one of the bench. On one occasion he "had refused payment of their money to some men who would not "keep their proper hours of work upon the road ; they complained to "the bench at Cambridge, and beat him as usual, and returned to "Over, wearing favours in their hats and button-holes ; and in the "evening a body of them collected in front of his house, and shouted "in triumph.

"Mr. Robinson's evidence having brought me once more to the subject of the magistracy, I will take the opportunity of saying "that one disastrous effect of the general mal-administration is to "prevent many gentlemen, the most eligible in respect of understand- "ing and ability, from joining the body, or from acting with them in "the general business of the petty sessions. I could mention, were it "not perhaps invidious, the names of several persons whom I know to "have been so influenced, and whose services have been lost to the "side of good sense and propriety. Another cause of monopoly of the "parochial business in the most objectional hands is the power which "the paupers have of choosing their own tribunal. It was said "by a farmer the other day, of a most excellent and benevolent "gentleman in this county, 'We' (meaning the parish) 'could afford "to give him £100 a year, sir, if he would consent not to act.' "Another anecdote communicated to me at Gamlingay is also pretty "much to the point. The overseer there told me that a few days ago "he had a difference with several of the paupers about their parish "pay, when they summoned him before a magistrate who lives about "six miles off. On the day of their attendance there something "prevented the case being heard, and they all returned to Gamlingay "together. In passing the house of another magistrate, about two "miles from home, the overseer said, 'Now, my lads, here we are "close by ; I'll give you a pint of beer each if you'll come and have "it settled at once, without giving me any more trouble about it.'

Vestries and  
overseers  
thwarted in their  
plans by  
inconsiderate  
interference  
of justices.

"The proposal was rejected without hesitation. I merely mention this to show that paupers have their preferences, and that they consider it important to abide by them."

\* "The greatest evil of which I am aware is the facility with which every plan of the vestry or overseer is brought into question on the complaint of the pauper, who selects a kind and often considerably liberal magistrate as his patron."

Can anything show more clearly than this evidence, recorded by the Poor Law Commissioners themselves, that where such powers were exercised by the magistrates the interest and responsibility taken and felt by the inhabitants in Parish welfare must have been gradually broken down under the exasperating want of all fair play to vestry management?

It appears, however, that the change in the law spread very slowly among the parishes. This was but natural because as the administration by the inhabitants was admittedly successful, magistrates would be reluctant to interfere, more especially as it was their own authority which had been discredited by rebuke from an Act of Parliament passed mainly with the object of curtailing their own powers in ordering relief. *Under such circumstances the inhabitants would be encouraged to resist interference and the magistrates less disposed to venture upon it.* Still, the action of a weak vestry might at any time tempt a strong magistrate to exert the powers given to him by the new law upon appeal, and, therefore, any attempts to represent the breakdown in administration of the old poor law as due to the incapacity and corruption of parochial management should depend upon evidence belonging to a period PRIOR TO THE 9TH GEORGE I. The charges of a DATE SUBSEQUENT to the passing of that Act require careful examination before any inference adverse to parish management can fairly be drawn.

Provisions of 9  
George I. spread  
very slowly  
among the  
parishes.

With indepen-  
dence and full  
responsibility  
OPEN VESTRIES  
conducted  
parish affairs  
with thorough-  
ness, order, and  
economy.

There is a mine of easily accessible evidence to show how the inhabitants when in vestry assembled conducted their parish affairs, made their rates, and administered poor relief. Vestry records of this time consist of resolutions, statements of account, and the actual contracts connected with parish business. The contracts stand in the vestry book and the business was taken down at the time, the entries being

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 86.

attested at each vestry by those present signing the book in each other's presence. No evidence can have greater authority than this, and the picture it presents shows the business-like thoroughness and order with which open vestries having the aid of a common knowledge in their parish affairs, and under the pressure of real and serious responsibility, managed, promptly and with very little division of opinion, to meet all the needs of local life. *It would clearly be unfair to make a selection out of the mass of material provided by the records of parish vestries.* I have, therefore, inserted in the appendix the records of vestry belonging to the parish of Finchley, for no other reason than that it is the parish in which I have personally been longest associated. The vestry records of this parish previous to 1768 were unfortunately burned with the other contents of the parish chest early in the present century, and the existing records do not go further back than 1768. The minutes of these early meetings show that the parishioners checked every item of the Overseer's accounts, and that relief was given or confirmed by the parishioners in Vestry assembled. The parish Vestry was thus a Court full of knowledge of and interest in its work, because every person could easily, in the parish area, get access to the facts and clear them. The Vestry audit and the parish officer's responsibility were so precise and concentrated that nothing could escape the knowledge and control of the inhabitants. The appendix, containing four complete years of the Vestry minutes of Finchley Parish during the latter half of the last half century, will show how the inhabitants of a parish, then quite rural, of medium size and population, managed their affairs.

I have described the powers of Acts of Parliament by which, during about 150 years, the freedom and authority of the inhabitants in the management of poor relief were progressively increased with the result at this time, according to Professor Fawcett, that "*it appeared not unlikely "that pauperism would, in the course of a few years, be almost "exterminated.*" I have now to point out the powers of interference, provided by successive Acts of Parliament under which the inhabitants were deprived of power to deal with poor relief upon their judgment and local

During 150 years from 43rd Elizabeth independent parish management had "NEARLY EXTERMINATED PAUPERISM," thenceforward centralization by successive legislative steps suppressed independent parish management.

knowledge with the result that, to use the words of the same statesman, “*pauperism assumed such alarming proportions about the year 1832 as almost to threaten the country with national bankruptcy and permanent ruin.*” The great success proceeding from parish management of the poor lifted off the pressure of anxiety with regard to the increase of pauperism, and consequently gave an opportunity for interference from *outside* sentiment, which is usually disposed to promote an irresponsible liberality in poor relief. A tendency to centralize administration was developed, and gradually the power of the inhabitants was placed in subordination to those who might be entirely without local knowledge of or interest in the parish.

22 George III.  
An endeavour to  
squeeze out all  
parish control  
and indepen-  
dence by close  
centralization.

No further Act materially affected the administration of poor relief in rural parts until 22 George III., chap. 83 (otherwise known as Gilbert’s Act), passed in 1782. This statute *took away wholesale* the powers of the inhabitants and devised complicated centralizing machinery, thus:—

Inhabitants were to recommend 3 persons for Guardian and 3 persons for Governor of Poorhouse to the magistrates, who were required to select and appoint for each office one person out of those so recommended.

The Guardians were to recommend 3 persons for visitor, one of whom was to be appointed by the magistrates.

The Visitor could appoint a Deputy.

The Treasurer to be appointed by the magistrates.

In the absence of justices within the limit, justices outside the limit were empowered to act.

Visitor and Guardians (both being appointed by magistrates) were empowered to borrow money, and were to be incorporated for that purpose.

By Section xxxii. the Guardians were required to find employment to the poor near to their own houses. The provision of test labour must always be a matter of great difficulty, and a crude obligation of this kind shows the lengths to which theoretic centralization, when uncorrected by practical experience, will go.

Section xxxvii. provides that the penalties inflicted upon Guardians may be given to the poor person aggrieved.

The 22nd George III. possessed one redeeming clause : viz., that which made it permissive, but from the general character of the Act many surrounding influences would have been set to work to beguile parishes into adopting it.

Such an Act was fitly followed by 33 George III., chap. 55, which enabled the justices at petty sessions to fine the overseers for disobedience to the order of *any justice or justices*, whether within or without the jurisdiction. The power to do this, as well as the power enabling justices to give part of the fine inflicted upon a guardian to the pauper complaining against him, illustrate the thoughtlessness of centralization in so degrading unpaid service as to render it unendurable to persons with self-respect. All local effort is wrecked by the debasing disruption which follows upon a degradation of local public duty. Who, under such conditions, would consent to serve, except persons designing to make some profit out of their office?

By the Act of 36 George III., chap. 23, the power of the inhabitants to impose the test of the workhouse as a security against imposition by wilfully idle persons was finally taken away from the vestry. The Act, after reciting the clause giving power to the vestry to impose the workhouse test, says :—

“And whereas the said provision contained in the Act above-mentioned has been found to have been and to be inconvenient and oppressive, inasmuch as it often prevents an industrious poor person from receiving such occasional relief as is best suited to the peculiar case of such poor person, and inasmuch as in certain cases it holds out conditions of relief injurious to the comfort and domestic situation and happiness of such poor persons : Be it therefore enacted, that it shall and may be lawful for the overseer or overseers of any parish, town, township, or place, *with the approbation of the parishioners*, or the majority of them, in vestry or other usual place of meeting assembled, *or with the approbation in writing of any of His Majesty's justice or justices of the peace usually acting in and for the respective district*, to distribute and pay collection and relief to any industrious poor person or persons, at his, her, or their homes, house or houses, under certain circumstances of temporary illness or distress, and in certain cases respecting such poor person, or his, her, or their family, or respecting the situation, health, or condition of any poorhouse or poorhouses, in any parish, town, township, or place, wherein a house or houses shall have been or shall be so hired, built or purchased, and a contract made with any person or persons for lodging, keeping, maintaining, and employing any or all poor persons who shall desire to receive collection or relief, although such poor person or persons

33 George III.  
presents  
centralization  
proceeding by  
its normal  
method of  
degrading  
unpaid local  
service.

36 George III.  
took from  
parishes power  
to impose  
workhouse test,  
and gave power  
to Magistrates  
to order relief as  
they thought fit.

“ shall refuse to be lodged, kept, and maintained, within such house or houses, anything in the said Act passed in the ninth year of His Majesty King George the first to the contrary notwithstanding.”

Section II. of this Act gave power to the magistrates to override any arrangements made by churchwardens or overseers, and enabled them to order relief in such amount and to such persons as they might think fit. The wording of the section is :—

“ And that it shall and may be lawful for any of his Majesty's justices or justices of the peace for any county, city, town, or place, usually acting in and for the district wherein the same shall be situated, at his or their just and proper discretion, to direct and order collection and relief to any industrious poor person or persons, and he, she, or they shall be entitled to ask and to receive such relief at his, her, or their homes, house, or houses, in any parish, town, township, or place, notwithstanding any contract shall have been or shall be made with any person or persons for lodging, keeping, maintaining, and employing any and all poor persons in a house or houses for such purpose hired or purchased, and the churchwarden or churchwardens, overseer or overseers, for such parish, town, township, or place, are required and directed to obey and perform such order for relief given by any justice or justices as aforesaid.”

By 1796, vestries had ceased to have any responsibility for poor relief.

By these quotations it appears that from this period (1796) *about the time when the maladministration of poor relief began, the Vestries had ceased in most parts of the country to have any responsibility for it.* The overseers who had just become liable to punishment by magistrates could act with the inhabitants or with the magistrates, and in all cases the magistrates had power to act at their discretion supreme over parish officers and vestries, and subject to no appeal.

Overseers liable to punishment by magistrates were induced to behave treacherously to inhabitants.

The 36 George III., chap. 23, really offered an invitation to the overseers to disregard the inhabitants, which must have induced corruption and intrigue. Through an unbearable and degrading pressure an enormous inducement was put upon overseers to behave treacherously to the ratepayers. The overseers could act “ *with the approbation of the inhabitants or with the approbation in writing of any of His Majesty's justice or justices,* ” that is to say, the overseer might act with the parishioners whose disapprobation could not hurt him instead of with the magistrate whose disapprobation would be serious,

because he possessed power to punish the overseer for disobedience. It is significant that this Act was not to apply to parishes which would consent to enter the spider's web of centralization provided by Gilbert's Act of 1782.

In 1801 the 41 George III., chap. 9, by Section I. gave magistrates power to appoint as many persons as they should think fit to be guardians. By Section III. it gave the guardians power with approbation of a "magistrate appointed visitor" to make an order on the churchwardens and overseers for the payment of money for poor relief purposes, and gave to magistrates power to enforce the guardians' order.

The Acts 42 George III., chap. 74,  
 43 George III., chap. 110,  
 45 George III., chap. 54,  
 50 George III., chap. 49.

were all Acts endeavouring to improvise some remedy for the mischiefs accruing from the power of the "magistrate appointed guardians" to spend and borrow money without consent of the inhabitants. By reference to the historical Table of Expenditure (p. 77) it will be seen that at this period, about 1801, the cost of poor relief and the rating for it had risen enormously, really through the suppression of local responsibility. It had thus not taken centralized authority long to bring affairs into an alarming condition. Instead of turning for help to local knowledge, however, further arbitrary powers were obtained from the Acts of Parliament quickly succeeding one another, and the general situation became worse in consequence.

The most important of the Acts passed at this time was 50 George III., chap. 49, by which the examination and allowance of overseers' accounts was transferred from the inhabitants to the magistrates. Such powers given to magistrates could do nothing to promote economy, but would do much to cause desirable persons to avoid the duty of serving their parish. Auditors to be useful ought to understand all material facts. Such knowledge the parishioners necessarily had, and they could join with it an appreciation, which it is impossible for any one not living in the parish to obtain, of the circumstances and

*In 1801,  
 "Magistrate  
 appointed"  
 guardians were  
 allowed to force  
 taxation and to  
 spend and  
 borrow money  
 without consent  
 of inhabitants.*

*50 George III.,  
 chap. 49  
 transferred  
 audit of over-  
 seers' accounts  
 from inhabitants  
 to magistrates.*

details connected with the accounts. Magistrates, of course, could rarely be in a position to have this local knowledge. The parishioners knew the why and the wherefore of payments. *The parish audit was thus an audit by the persons who had to provide the money, and who had, therefore, the strongest motives of keen self-interest for a strict audit and check upon parish payments and parish taxing.* But this audit, although based upon so good a foundation, and against which no complaint appears to have been made, was superseded by a magistrates' audit. Their audit would be necessarily inferior from want of knowledge and appreciation of the details and necessities which so largely affect the true validity of an account. Moreover, the magistrates would seldom be moved by self interest to the minute examination indispensable to a useful audit. In practice the number of such parish audits, and the usual remoteness of petty sessions from the parishes, would render the examination of accounts likely to be very hasty, and it would be difficult for the inhabitants, especially for the poor, to be present at petty sessions to urge any complaint against matters in the accounts. A singular and indeed unconstitutional result of this Act was that the magistrates were made judges in their own case because they were constituted auditors under the Act for payments which they had themselves authorized.

50 George III., chap. 50, gave power to force parishes into the spider's web of 22 George III.

In 1810 the 50th George III., chap. 50, enabled magistrates to force under the powers of 22 George III., chap. 83, those parishes which had up to that time declined to place themselves within its centralizing network. This Act also gave magistrates jurisdiction as overseers of the poor. The evils of the administration had risen to an acute pitch, and all through it can be seen that the corruption and folly of management increased in proportion as a remote authority thrust aside the parish knowledge of the poor possessed by the inhabitants.

Act 55, George III., gave magistrates power to order relief for three or six months.

Almost every constitutional safeguard had now been pretty well knocked away, still legislation towards further centralization was entered upon. Thus the Act of 55 George III., chap. 137 enabled one justice to order relief to the poor to be paid at their own homes for *three* months, and two justices for *six* months. AT THIS TIME (ABOUT

1815) CENTRALIZATION WAS RUNNING AT ITS HIGHEST PRESSURE. IT HAD BY THE AGENCY IMPOSED UPON THE MAGISTRATES SO ABSORBED THE DIRECTION OF POOR RELIEF THAT THE ADMINISTRATION WAS DEPRIVED OF ALL LOCAL ASSISTANCE, EXCEPT THAT DESCRIPTION OF IT WHICH FOR VENAL REASONS WOULD CONSENT TO BEAR THE BURDEN-SOME AND PERSONALLY DEGRADING CONDITIONS DEVISED UNDER THE LATER LEGISLATION.

By the next Act the 59 George III., chap. 12, the beginning of the end commenced. The general breakdown of the centralized system of poor relief administration was practically recognised. The powers of magistrates were very largely restricted in the case of parishes adopting the Act; in the case of parishes not adopting the Act, an order for relief was to be made by *two or more* justices, and not to be given for a longer time than one month—in cases of emergency and distress one justice could make an order, but not for longer than 14 days—and by a most important provision of Section XXXV. all powers by justices were to be exercised “within the limits of their respective commissions and jurisdictions and not elsewhere.”

It is quite evident that under the 59 George III., chap. 12, a new departure was commenced, for this Act plainly recognised that local interest and local knowledge were desirable aids in poor relief management. As a partially new form of administration was entered upon by this statute, it is desirable to note the consequences and the curious practices of administration brought into existence by the centralized system. I have shown that under the direct self-management of the inhabitants, for more than 160 years—

For more than 160 years direct parish management made rating low, whereas in 40 years the centralization of poor relief management caused a crushing taxation.

(1.) The burden of poor relief was low and tended to decrease.

(2.) The confidence of the legislature was amply evidenced by legislation confirming and extending the powers of the inhabitants.

(3.) No complaint arose until the open vestry system was crippled by the injurious and unforeseen consequences of an appeal power, given to

justices in an Act passed expressly to take from justices their power to order relief, and to enable the parishioners only to decide "whom they should "think fit and allow to receive relief."

(4.) In proportion as centralized authority was allowed to suppress local self-management, very grave evils from wide-spread demoralization together with a crushing taxation were developed.

## PART II.

### *Chapter I.—The Parish and Poor Relief.*

### *Division III.—The Centralized Management at Work.*

Centralizing bias of 1834 report, shewn by omission to refer to Gilbert's Act, intended to stifle all parish independence.

A STRONG inclination in favour of centralization is apparently manifested in the report of the Poor Law Commissioners of 1834. Their omission to refer to the failure of the elaborate network of centralization, devised by the provisions of 22 George III., an Act which the magistrates under 50 George III. were empowered to make compulsory, is most difficult to understand. Then the omission in their quotation of 3rd and 4th William and Mary, of the words "*or as often as it shall be thought convenient*" is also noteworthy, because nothing in the Act is more important than the power it gave to the inhabitants to meet together for parish purposes as frequently as they thought necessary. Without that power, poor relief management would have been impracticable for parishes. If this bias on the part of the Commissioners did exist, it increases the value of their

evidence, for the report certainly shows no “misconduct” until the vestries were interfered with, and then the “misconduct” did not belong to the vestries but to the centralized administration, and it *increased in proportion to the extent to which power was taken from the inhabitants.*

No charge can fairly be made against the magistrates as a body, and but rarely against them individually; the centralizing legislation forced them into a most cruel position by imposing duties it was impossible for any human being to fulfil satisfactorily. Nothing can replace the local knowledge derived from sight and self-interest as guarantees for the capable and strict management of poor relief. The Poor Law Commissioners say:—\*

Centralization forced impossible duties upon magistrates.

“The magistrate, even if he have a general knowledge of the subject, seldom can acquire a knowledge of the individual facts on which he has to decide. A pauper claims 3s. on the ground that his family consists of five persons, and that he has earned during the last week only 7s. The overseers believe that he has, in fact, earned more, or that he might have earned more if he had thought fit to exert himself, or that the lowness of his acknowledged earnings is the result of a collusion between him and his employer, in order to throw part of his wages on the parish. The vestry agrees in opinion with the overseer, and the pauper appeals to the magistrate. If questions like these, so difficult to proof, and the two latter matters of opinion not of perception, are to be decided, it must be by a tribunal acquainted with the habits and character of the applicant, and of his employers, capable of collecting and weighing many minute indicia of evidence, and ready to undergo so tedious and unsatisfactory a task. Can it be expected that it will be performed, or even undertaken by the magistrates, who give a few hours a week to the affairs of twenty parishes, who live at a distance from the scene of the dispute, and know little more than the names of the parties to it, and perhaps not even so much? In fact, the appeal is made from those who are acquainted with the general nature of the subject to be inquired into, to those who are ignorant of it; from those who either know the facts, or have the power to ascertain them, so far as they are capable of being ascertained, to those who have no previous knowledge of the matter, no interest in diligent investigation, and no means to render that investigation successful.”

Not only had the magistrates not time to go minutely into details, but, had they been able to do so, relief given upon evidence brought from a distance must inevitably have given rise to great abuses. The overseer himself might know perfectly well the true condition of facts, but

Overseers could only furnish Magistrates with knowledge by report.

\* Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 83.

from an inability on his part to describe them, or on the magistrate's part to inform himself by the description, or even from intrinsic difficulty in the case itself, it might be impossible for any person living *out of reach of the facts to understand them or to deal with them*. Under such circumstances, as the authority could not acquire the necessary knowledge for administration, that happened which always must happen whenever a centralized system endeavours to discharge duties completely local in their nature. *Crude generalizations were propounded and embodied into systems of routine for treating pauperism wholesale by means of complicated machinery, full of fancied checks and safeguards of no working value.*

*"Allowance" system,  
"Roundsman" system,  
"Labour rate" system,  
"Scales of relief" system, devised by Magistrates and imposed by them.*

The "allowance" system, the "roundsman" system, the "labour rate" system, and "scales of relief," were monstrous inventions which disheartened the capable, sheltered pauperism till it became a vigorous and spreading growth, and tainted all classes with the demoralization of despair. They were devised and put in action by the Magistrates because they were utterly helpless from want of local and practical knowledge for the work imposed upon them. The evidence, which follows, shows how grossly unfair are the efforts continually made by interested centralizers to make parish powers and parish institutions play scapegoat for the dangerous situation to which the country was brought by the breakdown of the old Poor Laws under centralizing aggression.

The following are some of the scales issued by the magistrates for the direction of parish officers:—\*

#### "COUNTY OF CAMBRIDGE."

"The Churchwardens and Overseers of the Poor are requested to regulate the incomes of such persons as may apply to them for relief or employment according to the price of bread; namely:—

|   |              |    |    |                           |
|---|--------------|----|----|---------------------------|
| "A single woman,  | the price of | .  | 3  | quartern loaves per week. |
| "A single man   | :            | .  | 4  | ,"                        |
| "A man and his wife   | :            | .  | 7  | ,"                        |
| "A man and his wife and one child   | :            | 8  | ," | ,"                        |
| "A man and his wife and two children  | 9            | ," | ," | ,"                        |
| "A man and his wife and three children  | 11           | ," | ," | ,"                        |
| "Man, wife, four children and upwards, at the price of two quartern<br>"loaves per head per week. |              |    |    |                           |

"It will be necessary to add to the above income in all cases of sickness or other kinds of distress, and particularly of such persons

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, pp. 13, 14, 15.

“or families who deserve encouragement by their good behaviour,  
“whom parish officers should mark both by commendation and reward.

“By order of the magistrates assembled at the Shire Hall,  
“Cambridge,

“15th December, 1821,

“ROBERT GEE,  
“Clerk to the Magistrates.”

“TOWN OF CAMBRIDGE.

“The Churchwardens and Overseers of the Poor are requested to  
“regulate the incomes of such persons as may apply to them for relief  
“or employment, according to the price of fine bread, namely:—

|  |                |                           |
|--|----------------|---------------------------|
| “A single woman, the price of . . . .  | $3\frac{1}{2}$ | quartern loaves per week. |
| “A single man . . . . .  | $4\frac{1}{2}$ | ” ” ”                     |
| “A man and his wife . . . . .  | 8              | ” ” ”                     |
| “A man and his wife and one child .  | $9\frac{1}{2}$ | ” ” ”                     |
| “A man and his wife and two children .   | 11             | ” ” ”                     |
| “A man and his wife and three children .   | 13             | ” ” ”                     |
| “Man, wife, four children and upwards, at the price of $2\frac{1}{2}$ quartern<br>“loaves per head per week. |                |                           |

“It will be necessary to add to the above income in all cases of  
“sickness or other kind of distress; and particularly of such persons  
“or families who deserve encouragement by their good behaviour,  
“whom parish officers should mark both by commendation and  
“reward.

“By order of the Magistrates assembled at the Town Hall,  
“Cambridge,

“A. CHEVELL,  
“Clerk to the Magistrates.

“27th November, 1829.”

“ESSEX.—DIVISION OF CHELMSFORD, 1821.

“At a special Meeting of the Magistrates acting in and for the  
“said Division, held at the Justice Room in the Shire Hall, on Friday,  
“the 15th day of June, 1821—

“It was Resolved—

“That the undermentioned scale of relief, for the assistance of the  
“Overseers of the Poor within the said Division in relieving the  
“necessitous poor, be recommended; That they do provide each  
“person in every family with the means of procuring half-a-peck of  
“bread flour per week, together with 10d. per head for other neces-  
“saries, if the family consists of two only; 8d. per head, if three;  
“6d. per head, if four; and 5d. per head, if more than four.

“N.B.—The above-mentioned sums are exclusive of fuel.

“By order of the Magistrates,

“T. ARCHER, Clerk.”

| Price<br>of<br>flour<br>per<br>peck. | NUMBER IN FAMILY. |       |       |        |         |         |         |          |         |         |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------|-------|--------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|
|                                      | 2.                | 3.    | 4.    | 5.     | 6.      | 7.      | 8.      | 9.       | 10.     |         |
|                                      | s. d.             | s. d. | s. d. | s. d.  | £ s. d. | £ s. d. | £ s. d. | £ s. d.  | £ s. d. | £ s. d. |
| 1 6                                  | 3 2               | 4 3   | 5 0   | 5 10   | 0 7 0   | 0 8 2   | 0 9 4   | 0 10 6   | 0 11 8  |         |
| 1 9                                  | 3 5               | 4 7½  | 5 6   | 6 5½   | 0 7 9   | 0 9 0   | 0 10 4  | 0 11 7½  | 0 12 11 |         |
| 2 0                                  | 3 8               | 5 0   | 6 0   | 7 1    | 0 8 6   | 0 9 11  | 0 11 4  | 0 12 9   | 0 14 2  |         |
| 2 3                                  | 3 11              | 5 4½  | 6 6   | 7 8½   | 0 9 3   | 0 10 9  | 0 12 4  | 0 13 10½ | 0 15 5  |         |
| 2 6                                  | 4 2               | 5 9   | 7 0   | 8 4    | 0 10 0  | 0 11 8  | 0 13 4  | 0 15 0   | 0 16 8  |         |
| 2 9                                  | 4 5               | 6 1½  | 7 6   | 8 11½  | 0 10 9  | 0 12 6½ | 0 14 4  | 0 16 1½  | 0 17 11 |         |
| 3 0                                  | 4 8               | 6 6   | 8 0   | 9 7    | 0 11 6  | 0 13 5  | 0 15 4  | 0 17 3   | 0 19 2  |         |
| 3 3                                  | 4 11              | 6 10½ | 8 6   | 10 2½  | 0 12 3  | 0 14 3½ | 0 16 4  | 0 18 4½  | 0 20 5  |         |
| 3 6                                  | 5 2               | 7 3   | 9 0   | 10 10  | 0 13 0  | 0 15 2  | 0 17 4  | 0 19 6   | 1 1 8   |         |
| 3 9                                  | 5 5               | 7 7½  | 9 6   | 11 5½  | 0 13 9  | 0 16 0  | 0 18 4  | 0 1 0    | 7½ 1    | 2 11    |
| 4 0                                  | 5 8               | 8 0   | 10 0  | 12 1   | 0 14 6  | 0 16 11 | 0 19 4  | 1 1      | 9 1     | 4 2     |
| 4 3                                  | 5 11              | 8 4½  | 10 6  | 12 8½  | 0 15 3  | 0 17 9½ | 1 0 4   | 1 2 10½  | 1 5 5   |         |
| 4 6                                  | 6 2               | 8 9   | 11 0  | 13 4   | 0 16 0  | 0 18 8  | 1 1 4   | 1 4 0    | 1 6 8   |         |
| 4 9                                  | 6 5               | 9 1½  | 11 6  | 13 11½ | 0 16 9  | 0 19 6½ | 1 2 4   | 1 5 1½   | 1 7 11  |         |
| 5 0                                  | 6 8               | 9 6   | 12 0  | 14 7   | 0 17 6  | 1 0 5   | 1 3 4   | 1 6 3    | 1 9 2   |         |
| 5 3                                  | 6 11              | 9 10½ | 12 6  | 15 2½  | 0 18 3  | 1 1 3½  | 1 4 4   | 1 7 4½   | 1 10 5  |         |
| 5 6                                  | 7 2               | 10 3  | 13 0  | 15 10  | 0 19 0  | 1 2 2   | 1 5 4   | 1 8 6    | 1 11 8  |         |
| 5 9                                  | 7 5               | 10 7½ | 13 6  | 16 5½  | 0 19 9  | 1 3 0½  | 1 6 4   | 1 9 7½   | 1 12 11 |         |
| 6 0                                  | 7 8               | 11 0  | 14 0  | 17 1   | 1 0 6   | 1 3 11  | 1 7 4   | 1 10 9   | 1 13 4  |         |
| 6 3                                  | 7 11              | 11 4½ | 14 6  | 17 8½  | 1 1 3   | 4 9½    | 1 8 4   | 1 11 10½ | 1 15 5  |         |
| 6 6                                  | 8 2               | 11 9  | 15 0  | 18 4   | 1 2 0   | 1 5 8   | 1 9 4   | 1 13 0   | 1 16 8  |         |
| 6 9                                  | 8 5               | 12 1½ | 15 6  | 18 11½ | 1 2 9   | 1 6 6½  | 1 10 4  | 1 14 1½  | 1 17 11 |         |
| 7 0                                  | 8 8               | 12 6  | 16 0  | 19 7   | 1 3 6   | 1 7 5   | 1 11 4  | 1 15 3   | 1 19 2  |         |

## HUNDREDS OF UTTLESFORD, CLAVERING AND FRESHWELL, IN THE COUNTY OF ESSEX.

“ Parish officers are desired to regulate allowances according to the price of fine bread, &c. :—

| Quartern Loaves.         | 9d.   | 9½d.  | 9ld.  | 9½d.  | 10d.  | 10½d.       |
|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|
|                          | s. d.       |
| Single Woman . . .       | 3 2   | 3 3   | 2 3   | 2 4½  | 2 5½  | 2 6 2 6½    |
| Single Man . . .         | 4 3   | 3 0   | 3 1   | 3 2   | 3 3   | 3 4 3 5     |
| Man and Wife . . .       | 7 5   | 5 3   | 5 4½  | 5 6½  | 5 8½  | 5 10 5 11½  |
| Man and 1 child . . .    | 8 6   | 0 0   | 6 2   | 6 4   | 6 6   | 6 8 6 10    |
| Man and 2 children . . . | 9 6   | 9 6   | 6 11½ | 7 1½  | 7 3½  | 7 6 7 8½    |
| Man and 3 children . . . | 11 8  | 3 3   | 8 5½  | 8 8   | 8 11½ | 9 2 9 4½    |
| Man and 4 children . . . | 12 9  | 0 0   | 9 3   | 9 6   | 9 9   | 10 0 10 3   |
| Man and 5 children . . . | 14 10 | 6 6   | 10 9½ | 11 1  | 11 4½ | 11 8 11 11½ |
| Man and 6 children . . . | 16 12 | 0 0   | 12 4  | 12 8  | 13 0  | 13 4 13 8   |

“ It will be necessary to increase the above allowances in some cases, and the deserving should be particularly encouraged.

“ By order of the Magistrates of the Walden Division, 1826.

“ THOS. HALL, Clerk.”

The "scales of relief" and "labour rate" were among the most injurious of the methods by which parish action and responsibility were overwhelmed. The Poor Law Commissioners of 1834 quote a description, which would have applied to most of the counties of England, of the scale system as it existed in Oxfordshire.\*

"The evils of the scale system are so generally admitted that we think it sufficient to quote the following statement of them by Mr. Okeden, himself a magistrate of great experience, contained in his report from that part of Oxfordshire which lies west of the great canal.

"About twenty-four years ago the payment of head-money, by a scale, was introduced into all these divisions, and continues in full operation, with all its varieties of roundsmen, billet system, &c. "The magistrates decide on the sum which is, in their opinion, necessary for the support of a man and his wife and children, and, "by a scale, order the overseers to make up the man's low wages to that sum from the parish. This scale system is so complete that the history of one of the parishes is, in fact, the history of all. I will, therefore, lay before you a general statement of the working of this scale process throughout the western divisions of the county of Oxford.

"There is a trifling variation of the scale in some districts, but so small as hardly to deserve notice. One system, therefore, pervades all the districts, and all the parishes are governed precisely in the same form, only varying at times from the better or worse management of the overseers. The results of this system (of its illegality I need not speak) are now become apparent. The first and most prominent is that, from neglect of single men, and the lower place to which they have been and are forced in the scale, a series of early marriages has ensued, for the avowed purpose of increasing income, until a generation of superfluous labourers has risen up, all demanding work or pay from the scale. If this system continues, in ten years more another generation will be hastening on. The present race, which this illegal perversion of the poor laws has created, are playing the game of cunning with the magistrates and overseers; give them ten years and they will convert it into the dreadful game of force. My humble opinion is, that if some measure be not adopted to arrest the progress of the evil a fearful and bloody contest must ensue.

"But, besides, the first result of this scale system, namely, the creation of a generation of superfluous labourers, two others accompany it; one is the equalization of industry and idleness, the other that of honesty and dishonesty. I ask every overseer of the 104 parishes, the condition of which I investigated, whether the due regard was paid to character and industry in the granting of relief.

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 80.

“Every one openly and shamelessly avowed that no attention was “paid to either, but that *all* were relieved according to the scale. I “put the strongest possible case, that of a man who, by repeated “thefts and rogueries, had actually flung himself out of employ, so “that no farmer would permit him to enter his premises; the answer “was still the same, ‘We should relieve him and his family from the “scale.’ The odium of this part of the scale process the overseers “seem inclined to fling on the magistrates, and, I believe, with “reason.

“So much for the placing honesty and knavery on a level. With “regard to the equalization of industry and idleness, when the “honest industrious labourer sees by his side, on the road or in the “field, a notoriously lazy fellow dawdling over his work, what must “be the consequence? He reasons the case over in his mind, finds “that his idle companion, with the deduction of only 2d. per day, “receives as much as himself, and, of course, he relaxes in his work; “and indifference and laziness succeed to vigour and industry: the “industry of the labourers is everywhere decidedly diminished, “agricultural capital is on the wane; the poor regard the allowance “as a right, and it is called sometimes ‘the county allowance,’ some-“times ‘the Government allowance,’ sometimes ‘the Act of Parlia-“ment allowance,’ and always ‘our income.’”

It is indisputable that these systems of inflexible routine for poor relief were originated by the magistrates in their endeavour to cope with the impossible duties forced upon them by unreflecting centralization. The report of itself furnishes ample evidence that the *practice of administration was in many cases soon brought round to follow* the course of the later centralizing legislation. Where it did so it necessarily destroyed all responsible action on the part of vestries and parish officers. They had been brought under very arbitrary powers of coercion into a subordination most destructively complete.

Breakdown of  
poor relief  
conclusively  
attributable to  
centralizing  
legislation.

It is quite useless to dispute the conclusion that the breakdown under which the later Poor Laws, “became a formidable engine, destructive to the morals and property of the country,” is clearly attributable to the centralized administration which they brought into action.

Mr. Tweedy, in his report, says:—\*

“At Kettlewell (in Craven) and the neighbourhood the same system prevails. The rule of the magistrate is to allow so much as “will yield 1s. 6d. per head per week, and the overseers take this “rule, therefore, as their guide. The overseer has sometimes called

---

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report of 1834, page 16.

" upon little farmers for their rates, and found that they had *no* provisions of any kind in the house, *nor* money to buy any : while, " on the other hand, he has not unfrequently been obliged to give " relief to men who, there is no doubt, could have procured work if " they had exerted themselves. They speak of it as a matter of " right; and, if what they ask be not granted, they threaten to " appeal to the magistrate, and, as he lives *fifteen* miles off, the over- " seers are often induced to yield to their demands, on account of the " expense of meeting the claim before him."

" The places above named are within the jurisdiction of one bench " of magistrates."

It is no matter for surprise if respectable persons refused to serve the office of Overseer, when they were liable to be forced to appear before a magistrate *fifteen miles off*, who could know nothing of local circumstances.

Mr. Villiers, another assistant commissioner, says :—\*

" I was able to examine some parishes in nearly every magisterial division of the county of Warwick, in the three principal hundreds of the county of Worcester, and in the adjoining parts of Gloucestershire ; and I communicated personally with the overseers and other officers from the hundreds and principal towns in north Devon.

" In each of these counties the relief is regulated upon the same general principle, namely, to believe all claimants according to their alleged actual necessities, and in each a separate table of relief, varying with the condition of the pauper and the price of bread, has been drawn up and published by the magistrates for the guidance of overseers."

The Report gives evidence upon the practice in Berkshire and Wiltshire :—†

" The following are extracts from the valuable answers of Mr. Russell, a magistrate residing in Swallowfield, in the counties of Berks and Wilts, to our printed queries :—

" The parish gives the labourers, out of the poor-rates, what they call sometimes their '*make up*,' and sometimes their '*bread money*.' The *bread money* is calculated weekly, at the price of two gallon loaves for the husband, one for the wife, and one for each of the children, be the number what it may; and to whatever extent of the earnings of the family may fall short of that sum, the difference is *made up* in money. This allowance is given in compliance with an order made many years ago by the magistrates of this county (Berks), and, practically, is in all cases enforced by them. I have known a magistrate, on an application made by a pauper for his *bread money*, exclaim that no such thing as *bread money* was recognised by the bench, and then make an order, with the mere omission of the term, for the precise amount demanded.

---

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 17.

†Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, pp. 17-18.

"No attention is paid to either the character of the applicant or the causes of his distress. In fact, he is considered entitled to it without pleading any distress."

"The *bread money* is hardly looked upon by the labourers in the light of parish relief. They consider it as much their right as the wages they receive from their employers, and in their own minds make a wide distinction between 'taking their *bread money*' and 'going on the parish.'"

"In other parishes the labourer is not supposed to earn more than a given sum. If that sum be less than the sum to which the size of his family entitles him, he receives the difference from the parish."

"At Thaxted, Essex, the overseer states":—

"That allowance is regulated by the price of flour; that the magistrates direct half a peck of flour for each individual of the family, besides 6d. each for the father and mother, and 4d. for each child. If wages do not amount to this, they are to be made up out of the poor-rate. A man's weekly earnings are reckoned at 8s. If he makes more, still he receives his allowance, in order that industry may not be discouraged."

Administration under a centralized system makes investigation impracticable; because the responsible authority is always so remote that a reference to it is wastefully laborious and tedious.

"A case was mentioned to me," says Mr. Stuart,\* "of nine men who had been able to earn 15s. each by taskwork in three days, and who came to the parish for the other three days of the week during which they had no employment. The overseer, aware of the profitableness of work in which they had been engaged, offered 1s. a day for the lost days, instead of 1s. 6d. a day, which would have been their allowance according to the scale. This the men rejected; left the work which they then had, and went to a magistrate to complain. The magistrate sent an open note by the complainants, appealing to the humanity of the overseer. The men, aware of the contents of the note, backed the recommendation of the magistrate by threats, which induced the overseer to comply."

The helplessness of centralization is most clearly shown by its absurd attempts to substitute automatic rules to be worked with a mechanical subordination by overseers or the inhabitants of parishes. CENTRALIZATION ALWAYS ASSUMES THAT NO MIND EXISTS AMONG "THE NEIGHBOURS TO THE NECESSITY."

In Berkshire the magistrates directed the giving of relief upon the double basis of number of family and the price of bread.†

---

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 19.

†Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 75.

"This shows, at one view, what should be the Weekly Income of the Industrious Poor, as settled by the Magistrates for the County of Berks, at a Meeting held at Speenhamland, May the 6th, 1795.

|                           |    |    | Income should be<br>for a Man. |    |    |    |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|---------------------------|----|----|--------------------------------|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
|                           |    |    | For a Single<br>Woman.         |    |    |    |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|                           | s. | d. | s.                             | d. | s. | d. | s.  | d. | s. | d. | s. | d. | s. | d. | s. | d. | s. | d. | s. | d. |    |    |
| When the gallon loaf is . | 1  | 0  | 3                              | 0  | 4  | 6  | 6   | 0  | 7  | 6  | 9  | 0  | 10 | 6  | 12 | 0  | 13 | 6  | 15 | 0  |    |    |
| When                      | "  | "  | 1                              | 1  | 3  | 32 | 14  | 10 | 6  | 5  | 8  | 0  | 9  | 11 | 2  | 12 | 9  | 14 | 4  | 15 | 11 |    |
| When                      | "  | "  | 1                              | 2  | 3  | 62 | 25  | 2  | 6  | 10 | 8  | 6  | 10 | 2  | 11 | 10 | 13 | 6  | 15 | 2  | 16 | 10 |
| When                      | "  | "  | 1                              | 3  | 3  | 92 | 35  | 6  | 7  | 3  | 9  | 0  | 10 | 9  | 12 | 6  | 14 | 3  | 16 | 0  | 17 | 9  |
| When                      | "  | "  | 1                              | 4  | 4  | 02 | 46  | 10 | 7  | 8  | 9  | 6  | 11 | 4  | 13 | 2  | 15 | 0  | 16 | 10 | 18 | 8  |
| When                      | "  | "  | 1                              | 5  | 4  | 02 | 56  | 11 | 7  | 10 | 9  | 9  | 11 | 8  | 13 | 7  | 15 | 6  | 17 | 5  | 19 | 4  |
| When                      | "  | "  | 1                              | 6  | 4  | 32 | 66  | 3  | 8  | 3  | 10 | 3  | 12 | 3  | 14 | 3  | 16 | 3  | 18 | 3  | 20 | 3  |
| When                      | "  | "  | 1                              | 7  | 4  | 32 | 76  | 4  | 8  | 5  | 10 | 6  | 12 | 7  | 14 | 8  | 16 | 9  | 18 | 10 | 20 | 11 |
| When                      | "  | "  | 1                              | 8  | 4  | 62 | 86  | 8  | 10 | 11 | 0  | 13 | 2  | 15 | 4  | 17 | 6  | 19 | 8  | 21 | 10 |    |
| When                      | "  | "  | 1                              | 9  | 4  | 62 | 96  | 9  | 9  | 0  | 11 | 3  | 13 | 6  | 15 | 9  | 18 | 0  | 20 | 3  | 22 | 6  |
| When                      | "  | "  | 1                              | 10 | 4  | 92 | 107 | 1  | 9  | 5  | 11 | 9  | 14 | 1  | 16 | 5  | 18 | 9  | 21 | 1  | 23 | 5  |
| When                      | "  | "  | 1                              | 11 | 4  | 92 | 117 | 2  | 9  | 7  | 12 | 0  | 14 | 5  | 16 | 10 | 19 | 3  | 21 | 8  | 24 | 1  |
| When                      | "  | "  | 2                              | 0  | 5  | 03 | 07  | 6  | 10 | 0  | 12 | 6  | 15 | 0  | 17 | 6  | 20 | 0  | 22 | 6  | 25 | 0  |

The inevitable result of displacing individual investigation for poor relief by such mechanical routine was to develop pauperism enormously under the inducements and facilities so provided. *The brutalizing consequences of wholesale and systematic pauper making* cannot be better described than in the words of the Poor Law Commissioners.\*

"The worst results, however, are still to be mentioned; in all ranks of society the great sources of happiness and virtue are the domestic affections, and this is particularly the case among those who have so few resources as the labouring classes. Now, pauperism seems to be an engine for the purpose of disconnecting each member of a family from all the others; of reducing all to the state of domesticated animals, fed, lodged, and provided for by the parish, without mutual dependence or mutual interest.

"The effect of allowance," says Mr. Stuart, "is to weaken, if not to destroy, all the ties of affection between parent and child. Whenever a lad comes to earn wages, or to receive parish relief on his own account" (and this we must recollect is at the age of fourteen), "although he may continue to lodge with his parents, he does not throw his money into a common purse and board with them, but buys his own loaf and piece of bacon, which he devours alone. The most disgraceful quarrels arise from mutual accusations of theft; and, as the child knows that he has been nurtured at the expense of the parish, he has no filial attachment to his parents. The circumstances of the pauper stand in an inverted relation to those of every other rank of society. Instead of a family being a source of care, anxiety, and expense, for which he hopes to be rewarded by the filial return of assistance and support when they grow up, there is no

Centralization  
by displacing  
individual  
investigation  
in poor relief  
increased  
pauperism  
enormously.

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 59.

"period in his life in which he tastes less of solicitude, or in which he has the means of obtaining all the necessaries of life in greater abundance; but as he is always sure of maintenance, it is in general the practice to enjoy life when he can, and no thought is taken for the morrow. Those parents who are thoroughly degraded and demoralised by the effects of 'allowance,' not only take no means to train up their children to habits of industry, but do their utmost to prevent their obtaining employment, lest it should come to the knowledge of the parish officers, and be laid hold of for the purpose of taking away the allowance."

"Roundsman System,"  
"Parish Employment,"  
and other mechanical make-shifts, as put in force by Magistrates.

With regard to the "Roundsman System" the following are among the answers to the printed queries supplied by the Poor Law Commissioners:—\*

"Byfield, Northampton.—Charles Wetherell, Rector; T. Carter, J.P.—'Head money' is given indiscriminately to all families of labouring men with more than two children under 10 years of age, without inquiring into their earnings, at the rate of 1s. each for those exceeding two; latterly many petty tradesmen have laid claim to it, and their claims have, in too many instances, been acceded to." "T. C."

"Relief is given generally, according to a scale which the deputy overseer obtains at the magistrates' petty sessions." "C. W."

"Welford, Gloucester.—William Welch, Assistant Overseer."†

"The labourers changed their service much more frequently when they were paid a part of their money by the overseers (called 'head money'), which was an order from the magistrates, and persisted in them till we established a poorhouse, which has nearly done it away, and the labourers are becoming more respectable."

"Magistrates, when applied to, always make their orders according to the head money system, taking the labourer's earnings at the usual day-work price, without regard to the conduct or ability of the labourer."

What was called Parish Employment rested practically upon the same basis ‡

"In the township of Atherstone, Mr. Welday, a manufacturer, impatient of contributing his property to the encouragement of vice and idleness by paying men without exacting labour, purchased some water-carts himself, for the purpose of giving employment to paupers. The magistrates refused to allow them to be used after twelve o'clock in the day, in order that these men might procure work for themselves: they were also described as becoming the most worthless characters in the town."

"In some of the agricultural districts the prevalent mismanagement in this respect has created in the minds of the paupers a notion that it is their right to be exempted from the same degree of

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 22.

†Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 23.

‡Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, pp. 24-25.

"labour as independent labourers. In the parish of Swallowfield (Berks) the paupers summoned the overseers before the magistrates.  
"They had been—

"Offered task-work at a gravel pit at 8d. a yard, or 1s. a load for digging and sifting without loading. This has been considered a fair price with loading. The complainants contended before the magistrates that by what they considered 'a right' they ought not to be employed on the part of the parish more than from eight in the morning until four in the afternoon, although when working for farmers they were usually kept at work from six in the morning until six at night in summer, or from daylight until dark in the winter. This, which they claimed as 'their right,' had, in fact, been the previous practice in the parish, and was and is in a greater or less degree the existing practice in adjacent parishes."

**Mr. Villiers reports that in the parish of Hartland :—\***

"Mr. —, — who had occupied land there for 17 years, informed me that the magistrates were in the habit of ordering the same wages for the men working on the roads not superintended, as were paid to the labourers in the employ of the farmers; and that on this account, as well as that the poor liked to watch for the wrecks in the winter, they did not seek for work out of the parish."

**Another assistant commissioner reports from Sussex:—†**

"The billeting system having failed, a 6d. labour-rate was made: it soon failed. Magistrates now recommend 6d. in the pound to be deducted from the full rate, and that the occupier should be allowed to pay that proportion of his rate by employment of the surplus hands.

"The labourers are much deteriorated. They do not care whether they have regular work or not; they prefer idle work on the roads. The magistrates at the Uckfield bench told the overseers, the year before last, that if the men made complaint they should be allowed at the rate of 2s. 4d. per head for each member of the family.

"At Burnash, in East Sussex, in the year 1822, the surplus labourers were put up to auction, and hired as low as 2d. and 3d. per day, the rest of their maintenance being made up by the parish. The consequence was, that the farmers turned off their regular hands in order to hire them by auction when they wanted them. The evil of this system was so apparent that some occupiers applied to the magistrates, who recommended it should be given up. During the last year the following plan has been adopted: the names of the occupiers are written on pieces of paper, which are put into a bag; the labourer draws out a ticket, which represents 10s. worth of labour, at fair wages, next week the labourer draws another master, and this is repeated till the occupier has exhausted the shilling rate. This has continued two winters; much fraud is mixed up with the practice. Some farmers turn off their labourers in order to have ticketed men, other occupiers refuse to pay the rate, and against them it is not enforced."

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 25:

†Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 26.

**The Report of the Poor Law Commissioners says:—\***

“ Other classes of society are restrained from misconduct by fear “ of the evils which may result to their families. Parochial legisla- “ tion rejects this sanction. Even in Barnard Castle, in Northumber- “ land, Mr. Wilson states that if any remonstrance is made on account of “ the applicant’s bad character, the reply of the magistrate commonly “ is, ‘the children must not suffer for it.’ ”

“ The following answers are specimens of feeling and conduct in “ the southern districts:—

“ The answer given by the magistrates, when a man’s bad conduct is urged by “ the overseer against his relief is, ‘We cannot help that; his wife and family are “ not to suffer because the man has done wrong.’ ”

“ Too frequently petty thieving, drunkenness, or impertinence to a master “ throw able-bodied labourers, perhaps with large families, on the parish funds, “ when relief is demanded as a right, and, if refused, enforced by a magistrate’s “ order, without reference to the cause which has produced his distress, viz., his “ own misconduct, which remains as a barrier to his obtaining any fresh situation, “ and leaves him a dead weight upon the honesty and industry of his parish.”

Singular  
remarks by the  
Commissioners  
apparently  
exhibiting bias.

The observation of the Commissioners that “ Parochial legislation rejects this sanction ” seems incomprehensible; indeed, the expression, as it stands in the paragraph, has no meaning, but it again presents an evidence of the unfortunate bias which in some respects weakens occasionally the value of their Report. The action they complained of belonged to the magistrates. How could there be Parochial Legislation? In point of fact there was nothing of the kind. Centralization had created a parochial slavery which was fast levelling down all things local to its own degradation. The “legislation” in fault was that of the High Court of Parliament, and the administration was that by which parochial practice and responsibility were overwhelmed and destroyed.

Disastrous  
consequences  
attributable to  
the centralized  
system  
superceding  
parish control.

Another example quoted by the Commissioners shows how completely the thinking and responsible men of a parish must have been disheartened, and every chance for good administration crushed under the degrading coercion of centralized authority, helpless from local ignorance.†

“ Even the inconvenience which might fall on the husband by the “ punishment of his wife for theft is made the subject of pecuniary “ compensation at the expense of the injured parish. Under what “ other system could there be a judicial instrument concluding this:—

\* Poor Law Commissioners’ First Report, 1834, page 36.

† Poor Law Commissioners’ First Report, 1834, page 37.

"And whereas it appears to us that the wife of the said Robert Reed is now confined in the house of correction at Cambridge, and that he is put to considerable expense in providing a person to look after his said five children; we do therefore order the churchwardens and overseers of the poor of the said parish, or such of them to whom these presents shall come, to pay unto the said Robert Reed 'the sum of 11s. weekly and every week, for and towards the support and maintenance of himself and family, for one month from the day of the date hereof.

"Given under our hands and seals this twentieth day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-three."

Volumes of evidence could be produced to show the cruel and disastrous consequences brought upon the nation *not by the misconduct of vestries, but through the misconduct of the centralized system which displaced vestries.*

The magistrates apparently struggled hard to cope with the impossible task forced upon them. There appears to have been an even greater laxity of administration and grosser scandals under the practice followed in the stipendiary courts.\*

Laxity of administration and scandal greatest from practice of stipendiary magistrates.

"Evidence of Mr. Heritage, Chief Clerk of the Magistrates at "Worship Street.

"With regard to applications for summonses against parish officers "for refusing to grant relief, I may state that summonses are granted "indiscriminately upon application at our office. When the parish "officers attend upon the summonses, relief is ordered almost as indiscriminately. We have constantly fine, hale, hearty-looking young "men applying for relief.

"I have known an officer sent with as many as twenty paupers in "a day, with an order to see them relieved. It was not sufficient "that the officer left the paupers with the overseer; he was enjoined "by Mr. Bennett to see them relieved, and if there was no overseer to "be found, he was directed to relieve them out of his own pocket, the "magistrate promising that he would undertake that the overseer "should reimburse him the next day. This has been a practice for "several years; it has occurred most frequently on Saturdays. Now "the parish officers frequently attend to render these steps unnecessary.

"Mr. Bennett: This is generally on the Saturday night, when the "overseer has neglected to attend; of course, it would not be done "when the overseer is present.

"To-day three hearty young women, from eighteen to twenty "years of age, applied for relief; summonses were granted them "without any inquiry. I mentioned this case to Mr. Twyford, but "he seemed to think we had no discretion.

"The Act now allows only one magistrate to interfere in cases of "urgent necessity'; but they deem all cases to be of urgent necessity, "for the summonses are uniformly ordered by one magistrate."

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 86.

**At Cholesbury  
cost of  
maintaining  
poor exceeded  
whole yearly  
value of land.**

Of the effects through the cost of the flood of pauperism created by the action of centralized administration one illustration will suffice :—\*

" We are happy to say that not many cases of the actual dereliction " of estates have been stated to us. Some, however, have occurred, " and we have given in the extracts from our evidence the details of " one, the parish of Cholesbury, in the county of Bucks. It appears " that in this parish, the population of which has been almost stationary " since 1801, in which within the memory of persons now living the " rates were only £10 11s. a year, and only one person received relief, " the sum raised for the relief of the poor rose from £99 4s. a year in " 1816, to £150 5s. in 1831; and in 1832, when it was proceeding at " the rate of £367 a year, suddenly ceased in consequence of the im- " possibility to continue its collection; the landlords having given up " their rents, the farmers their tenancies, and the clergyman his glebe " and his tithes. The clergyman, Mr. Jeston, states that in October, " 1832, the parish officers threw up their books, and the poor assembled " in a body before his door, while he was in bed, asking for advice and " food. Partly from his own small means, partly from the charity of " neighbours, and partly by rates in aid, imposed on the neighbouring " parishes, they were for some time supported; and the benevolent rector " recommends that the whole of the land should be divided among the " able-bodied paupers, and adds ' that he has reason to think that at " the expiration of two years, the parish in the interval receiving the " assistance of rates in aid, the whole of the poor would be able and " willing to support themselves, the aged and impotent of course " excepted.' In Cholesbury, therefore, the expense of maintaining the " poor has not merely swallowed up the whole value of the land; it " requires even the assistance for two years of rates in aid, from other " parishes, to enable the able-bodied, after the land has been given up " to them, to support themselves, and the aged and impotent must " even then remain a burthen on the neighbouring parishes."

There is no need to proceed further with the dreary and repulsive catalogue of intolerable evils arising from a remote, and, therefore, ignorant direction of poor law relief.

The 59 George III. interposed with some remedy, and the new poor law at last destroyed the gross abuses which threatened to overwhelm the country.

The passing of the 43rd Elizabeth is separated from the Victorian New Poor Law by a period of 233 years. For about 170 years of that time poor relief was administered upon the basis of the 43rd Elizabeth, extended by subsequent legislation so as to establish a complete recog-

Flood of  
pauperism  
arrested by New  
Poor Law.

For about 170  
years out of 230  
poor relief  
managed  
independently  
by parishes with  
low and  
decreasing

\*Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 40.

nition of the direct self-management and responsibility by the inhabitants of parishes for and within their own parish only. It is notorious that the dangers and scandals of poor law management arose subsequently. Deducting 170 years, we come to about the year 1770, and it has been fully established that during the next 60 years, in proportion as the independence of *parochial administration disappeared, the dangers and scandals of poor law management continued to increase in peril and grossness.* This conclusion is confirmed by a comparison of the economical results of parish management with those of centralized management.

Eden gives the following statistics in regard to poor relief :—

| Year.         | Estimated population. | Expended. | Per head of population. |       |
|---------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------|
|               |                       |           | £                       | s. d. |
| In 1689 .. .. | —                     | 665,362   |                         |       |
| In 1750 .. .. | 6,467,000             | 689,000   | 2                       | 2     |

It thus appears that at the end of 60 years the amount of the poor rate had *really decreased* very considerably, if a fair allowance be made for increase of population. From this time the growth of the poor rate corresponds with the development of *administration centralized in persons not necessarily resident in the parish, or acquainted with its concerns.*

| Year.      | Estimated population. | Expenditure. | Per head of population. |       |
|------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------|
|            |                       |              | £                       | s. d. |
| 1760 .. .. | 6,736,000             | 965,000      | 3                       | 0     |
| 1770 .. .. | 7,428,000             | 1,306,000    | 3                       | 6     |
| 1780 .. .. | 7,953,000             | 1,774,000    | 4                       | 5     |
| 1790 .. .. | 8,675,000             | 2,567,000    | 5                       | 11    |
| 1800 .. .. | 9,140,000             | 3,861,000    | 8                       | 5     |
| 1810 .. .. | 10,370,000            | 5,407,000    | 10                      | 3     |
| 1818 .. .. | 11,702,000            | 7,890,000    | 13                      | 4     |
| 1820 .. .. | 12,046,000            | 7,329,000    | 12                      | 2     |
| 1830 .. .. | 13,924,000            | 6,829,000    | 9                       | 9     |
| 1832 .. .. | 14,372,000            | 7,036,000    | 9                       | 9     |

expenditure during next 60 years, as parochial administration was gradually broken down, poor rate charges increased enormously.

---

I have now, upon rather full evidence of the character of the poor relief legislation, and of the results which followed upon it, shown *the utter groundlessness of the charges made against the past parish management of poor relief*. Unless it is to be supposed that the people of this country cannot now show a capacity for co-operative administration equal to that exhibited by their forefathers in the 17th and 18th Centuries, why should not similar opportunities be afforded to the inhabitants of rural parishes in our own day?

---

## PART II.

### *Chapter I.—The Parish and Poor Relief.*

#### *Division 4.—The Path to True Reform.*

In rural parish  
the condition of  
“everybody  
knowing  
everybody else,”  
provides  
knowledge for  
successful out-  
door relief.

AT the outset it is necessary to point out that in the country poor relief, especially out-door relief, presents conditions entirely opposed to those which prevail in towns. The population of a rural parish is mostly small; the indigent poor are commonly as fixed in it by their habits and residence as any other class, and their failings and deserts are well known to the inhabitants generally, because the common dependence upon agricultural occupation bring all into touch with one another. This condition of “everybody knowing everybody else” is found only in country parishes. In an urban parish there is usually a large population, and its indigent poor tend to be nomadic in character so far as town conditions will allow, and are otherwise unsettled in habits and occupation. Thus in the towns those well off and those verging upon pauperism

are not brought into contact, they form two classes living side by side but isolated, and having little knowledge of one another. The clergy and district visiting may do much, but it must be work of charity only, and the conditions of an urban parish seem to defy the systematic local conservation which is aimed at by the care of its poor in a country parish. In controversies about poor law relief the opposite circumstances which prevail with regard to pauperism in town and country are too much overlooked. Country conditions are one thing and town conditions are quite another. The arguments and proposals now to be dealt with *exclusively* refer to rural parishes.

From the appendix of Finchley vestry minutes, to which I have referred before in this work, it may be seen how an open vestry managed during seventy or eighty years all the business of a rural parish of average value and area throughout the time when the centralized management of poor relief was bringing a large proportion of the rest of the country to the verge of bankruptcy. Owing to local reasons, closely connected with its near vicinity to London, the parish of Finchley in Middlesex contrived to retain an independent management of its affairs free from molestation by magistrates, visitors, guardians, or any kind of centralized control or interference, down to 1836. The vestry minutes show how all details, even the smallest, were dealt with under a constant check from the local knowledge of the inhabitants, and as a contemporary record they afford useful evidence of the habits of open village vestry, and of its faculty for dealing with local business. I have not gone out of the way to make a selection of matter, but have taken that which was at hand in the vestry minutes of my own parish, and no objection can be made to the evidential value of the extracts, because a *complete* copy has been taken of four separate years, at about equal intervals from each other. The extracts are thus made upon a sound principle, and they are of great reliability, because as minutes they must have been under the correction of the inhabitants, each man upon his fellow, from meeting to meeting. As each year's record is verbatim, without

Finchley Vestry  
minutes exhibit  
method and  
particulars of  
direct  
management  
of poor relief by  
ratepayers in  
rural parish.

omission, alteration or addition of any kind, the extracts are unfortunately lengthy, but no other method would have preserved their evidential value.

The earlier minutes having perished by fire, a complete transcript of vestry minutes of the first year of the portion now in existence has been taken—Easter, 1769, to Easter, 1770—the rateable value was £4,284, and the population was about 900.

*In the interval from 1769 to 1795 the highest poor rate in any year was 2s. 4d., and the lowest 6d.*

In the second year taken for a complete transcript of vestry minutes—from Easter, 1798, to Easter, 1799—the rateable value was £6,847, and the population was 1,503.

*In the interval from 1795 to 1820 the highest poor rate in any year was 3s. 9d., and the lowest 1s. 6d.*

In the third year taken for a complete transcript of vestry minutes—from Easter, 1825, to Easter, 1826—the rateable value was £9,959 15s., and the population was 2,349.

It can be seen from the Finchley parish minutes that the indigent poor were provided for partly by out-relief and partly by their parish workhouse. The inhabitants could take the course which, from the circumstances of each case, seemed best adapted to insure themselves against burden from rating, either present or to come. They would naturally seek to diminish the burden falling upon the parish from pauperism; they would avoid making it chronic and hopeless, for their endeavour would be to prevent and to cure, and this object would be better attained by doing all they could to prop up their weak parishioners. Out-relief might present itself as usually the preferable plan, because the moral and social stigma attaching to it is so very much less. In their own interest, the inhabitants would do all they could to sustain the chief levers for self-extrication, hope, and self-respect. They would not destroy them by forcing the workhouse upon the poor indiscriminately, as a centralized system with its distant management is compelled to do. Self-interest thus provides a powerful check, and in a small

area controlling an administration entirely within view, it has achieved a far greater success than any system wanting that stimulus.

There is a good deal of convenient blindness and wilful affectation about the official outcry for the abolition of outdoor relief. The danger does not belong to outdoor relief; it really proceeds from the insurmountable difficulties in managing it by centralized officialism.

The out-relief given in a rural parish places the recipients under the effective pressure of constant sight by the inhabitants and of their committee acting, during consent, on their behalf. What security or correction can equal this? How can the strain of discipline be better brought to bear and more justly apportioned between unavoidable calamity and chronic and callous pauperism? Rural union administration is destitute of the resources which a rural parish possesses for the supervision and control of out-relief, hence its helplessness about out-relief, a helplessness which compels it to press the workhouse alternative to an extent often unreasonably cruel to the poor, and very wasteful to the ratepayers' interest. The Poor Law Board have always been well aware that a centralized control cannot manage out-relief, and for that reason have endeavoured for nearly fifty years past to abolish it, *but have not succeeded, and are not likely to do so.*

The Act 4 and 5 Will. IV. chap. 76 Section 52 empowered the Poor Law Commissioners to regulate the administration of poor relief by orders, and in 1844 regulations under the too assuming title of "OUTDOOR RELIEF PROHIBITION ORDER" were issued. The "*Prohibitory*" effort of this order was, however, suffered to leak away in a long string of exceptions, and in 1852 an order with the less ambitious title of "OUTDOOR RELIEF REGULATION ORDER" was issued. The rules are probably as well framed as any general rules of such nature could well be; they classify cases, and set out the periods for relief, *but the system has not succeeded, nor is it ever likely to succeed.*

These Poor Law orders are singular, and rather melancholy reading. They instructively illustrate the besetting weakness of officialism, which always looks upon human-

In rural  
parish out-relief  
best because  
under  
constant sight.  
In unions, out-  
relief dangerous  
because beyond  
supervision.

Poor Law orders  
for prohibition  
of out-door  
relief hopelessly  
struggle against  
candour and  
good sense.

kind as a *mob*, to be manipulated in flocks and herds by its central mind. It is that sort of manipulation, *treatment by wholesale*, which most conduces to an increase of pauperism, and to hopeless and degraded forms of it. Nothing but *individual treatment*, with a full knowledge of circumstances and conduct, *personally felt as between the paupers and the poor relief managers*, can ameliorate pauperism, and work towards its cure. Common sense and experience, working under the pressure of those who have to pay in a parish, would do far more to repress pauperism than any number of Poor Law orders. The evils arising from out-relief have been due to the centralized and official administration entrusted with it—the Union administration. Parish charity organization, as a sole administration for dealing with pauperism in a rural parish, would make out-relief in various forms its main resource. All the endeavour exercised by the Local Government Board for the abolition of out-door relief will be unavailing, because the public never will consent that the poor should be pressed indiscriminately into work-houses, mainly from the desire to keep out of view the incompetency of Union management of out-door relief. It is an insult to common sense to suppose that temporary assistance, if given by a competent agency, will not often save homes from being broken up, and their owners from being left crushed and despairing to drift into the current of chronic pauperism or crime.

The parish offers  
most capable  
working and  
most strict  
accountability  
for management  
of Poor relief,  
especially Out-  
relief.

The results of direct self-management as practised all over England for 170 years with most striking success leave no room for doubt that a parish community can prudently, and with due regard to its own interests, sustain the destitute, aged, and infirm, or the temporarily distressed, in their own homes, and stimulate their efforts for self-help by suitable and closely superintended out-door relief. Such superintendence would be adapted to the circumstances of each case, with the object of making relief effectual for its purpose. The ratepayers would be spending their money for results brought completely within their knowledge—a condition which would greatly contribute to good administration and economy. The safe administration of out-door relief requires full knowledge of details and circumstances about the poor and careful superintendence

on the spot, by those living in the place. A committee acting for their own parish as a charity organization committee could, among themselves, perform this duty successfully ; and in a rural parish of average size, or if too large, then by assigning parts of its area to sub-committees, a parish charity committee could obtain so intimate a knowledge of the poor, *that the overlapping of relief* and other irregularities inseparable from ill-informed and remote official direction, could be entirely avoided. The charity committee, contemplated under the Bill embodied in the present work, would in a parish of an average population usually consist of not less than 15 persons ; in the case of a large and populous parish its area would be subdivided and its poor relief supervised by a larger number. Such a parish committee would discharge its duties under the observation of the ratepayers on whose behalf they were acting, and to whom they would be requested to give frequent account, and thus the requirements, the administration, and the responsibility would be mutually appreciated by the ratepayers and the committee they had appointed. *Can any conditions be conceived more favourable to sound local management and to a good understanding between the ratepayers and their committee for poor relief?*

The precautions to prevent abuses must all of them be rooted in a constant and close supervision of those to whom out-relief is given, and in an ordinary rural union area (say of 100 square miles with 30 to 50 parishes) such supervision is absurdly supposed to be carried out by the employment of *one or rarely more than two relieving officers*. So large a number of parishes if LEFT FREE TO MEET THEIR OWN DIFFICULTIES would secure assistance of *much better quality* than an ordinary relieving officer can give, and without any cost to the ratepayers, by establishing parish charity committees, comprising in all the parish committees a total number of *probably 300 to 400 persons*, and quite that number is necessary for the parishes of a large union to secure the constant and detailed supervision required. The parish has little difficulty in getting this supervision carried out with the intelligent and kindly feeling of parishioners working for each other in a common interest. *The union, on the other hand, has nothing to appeal*

Out-relief requires close abundant supervision of recipients at their own homes. A Parish can provide it, but it is impossible for the union to do so.

*to as it is disconnected from all local and traditional ties:* its relieving officers may pay the doles, they cannot supervise. The out-relief administration by one, or two, or three relieving officers hurrying over the large union area cannot be compared for efficiency with relief managed by a parish committee constantly acting with complete knowledge derived from sight within its own parish boundary. The members of a parish charity committee are always on the spot; they know each case, divide between them the duty of *visiting frequently all cases at their own homes*, and thus learn intimately the character and conduct of those receiving relief. The parish committee cannot be imposed upon; *the area is too limited for that;* they must know whether the relief given is properly spent for the sustenance of the family, and they cannot long be kept in ignorance of supplemental relief obtained from other charitable sources. Living in the same parish, all necessitous cases must be immediately known to them and can be promptly dealt with, whereas the relieving officer has neither the knowledge nor the time, and is too far away. It is a frequent practice for the relieving officer to summon the poor to *meet him at his pay table*, where he doles out the allowances and then hurries off again to his other parishes for a like performance. Can any practice be better calculated to foster sturdy pauperism and to leave the timid and worthier poor unrelieved?

"Test employment" is  
valuable safeguard which  
parish could  
freely use,  
but Union  
helpless because  
too far away.

It frequently happens that out-relief must be given to meet some temporary strain, due either to individual misfortune or to some general cause. Prolonged frost and snow cause distress and prevent employment—temporary relief must be widely given. A parish managing its own poor could easily provide work beforehand to meet this necessity. It can keep in reserve useful parish work to provide employment for its poor at times when distress is caused by an extensive suspension of ordinary employments. The minds and the self-interest of all the inhabitants being concentrated upon administration over a small area, the great difficulties and numerous details which have to be considered in reserving work for test employment can be successfully coped with. The union constantly proves its incompetence to provide any such reserve of labour.

Its area is so large that the Guardians are not in a position by their local knowledge to set apart convenient and useful work as a provision for Test Employment in the various parishes. The labour usually provided as "Test labour" by a union demoralizes and degrades the poor by its irritatingly wasteful character. The poor cannot travel from their parishes to the union because the distance and waste of time from travel are too great for them to go to the work and then return to their homes. On the other hand the union is altogether powerless about Test labour, for it cannot undertake the supervision of such labour in its various parishes. Test employment provided under parish organization could be made of economical advantage to the ratepayers, and at the same time in no way brutalising to the poor. Under union organization from the circumstance of the case Test employment must nearly always prove an economical failure and therefore injurious to the ratepayers, while the useless character of such work is degrading to the poor.

In times of great temporary need the distant union administration is soon overwhelmed. Practically it breaks down through its inherent weakness, and as a consequence the work is then most unfairly thrown back upon the parishes with the result that a number of voluntary agencies spring up to make good the union default. This leads to much over-lapping with inevitable mischief and waste. Necessitous cases go unrelieved while others get over-relieved.

A parish committee (acting, as all parish committees should act, only during consent of the inhabitants) would possess the confidence of the parish, and would, therefore, form a standing committee for the organization of all charity during times of distress; over-lapping in relief-giving would thereby be prevented, and a great source of corruption and weakness avoided. Such an organization (whether arising from charity or from local taxation), of all the resources for poor relief in a rural parish, would, if applied to a complete dealing with poverty, do much to extinguish it. Voluntary charity cannot really avoid becoming an aid to the rates—a state of matters very unfair as between

Distant union administration encourages sporadic charity.

Parish could organize all its charity for a complete dealing with its pauperism and the cure of it.

parishes in a union. With independent parish responsibility, on the other hand, the parish resources, whether from charity or rating, could be wisely employed by the inhabitants through their charity committee, for the *one* great obligation resting upon the ratepayers of making a proper provision for their parish poor.

County Council control standing between parishes and Local Government Board would improve both local management and National Control.

The decentralization of administration would require a corresponding decentralization of authority over poor-relief. The Local Government Board could not deal with out-door relief and the audit of accounts relating to some thousands of rural parishes, each of them acting as a separate administration. Very great advantage would follow by transferring from the Local Government Board its present control over out-door relief in the rural parishes to their County Councils. Control by a single central department over the whole of the country is compelled to work by labyrinthine regulation and cannot avoid being intensely official; but supervision, if close at hand, allows a flexible adaptation of means to ends, can simplify and reduce the details of regulation and can give effective assistance to parishes. County Council members would be men with intimate local knowledge, who could safely advise upon arrangements for assistance, or for control over the parishes of their districts. Of course County Councils are far too large in area and too remote for a direct administration of poor relief, but they are extremely suitable and well placed *for gathering the results about it from below where the facts lie*. An organization which prudently restricted its centralizing aim to the single purpose of securing a national control over all local administration, would thus obtain great help and relief from County Councils, if the latter became authorities standing between the Local Government Board and the parishes of their counties. The Local Government Board is now overweighted by the continuous repetition of routine supervision, and by its mass of official mechanism for detailed control. But the County Council control would be simple, effective, accessible and prompt, for it is established in the midst of the necessities with which it has to deal; its reply can follow quickly upon demand; it is less dependent upon mere report, and its officials are

personally near at hand, so that red tape has fewer opportunities for obstruction.

The Parish Government Bill proposes that the management of the workhouses, the indoor poor, infirmaries, &c., should continue as now, in the hands of a board of guardians, to be composed of the overseers of the rural parishes in the existing unions, together with the guardians of the urban parishes elected as heretofore, and this body would become the successors in law of the existing board of guardians. Each parish would contribute to the establishment charges in proportion to its rating value, and also for the maintenance of the paupers chargeable to it. The control over the union would remain with the Local Government Board as at present.

In connection with out-door relief, very considerable changes are provided for by the Bill. It proposes that the powers now exercised by boards of guardians should vest in the inhabitants, and that the overseers and a poor-relief committee to be appointed by the inhabitants, or in the absence of such special committee then the parish committee should (during consent by the inhabitants) exercise and perform within their parish all powers and duties in connection with the administration of out-door relief. The Bill further provides that the general powers and duties of the Local Government Board, as to the out-relief administered by the inhabitants of a rural parish, should be handed over to the County Council of the county to which the rural parish may belong. This transfer would include the audit of poor-relief accounts, the control as it now stands under the present regulations of the Local Government Board, and the power (subject to the approval of that Board) to make new regulations, or to modify or annul existing regulations for the guidance of such inhabitants.

---

Parish  
Government  
Bill proposes  
arrangements  
for *indoor* and  
*outdoor* relief in  
conformity with  
the different  
requirements  
for their  
administration.

## PART II.

*Chapter I.—The Parish and Poor Relief.**Division V.—Old Age Pensions.*

“Old Age Pensions” would provide a new and important bulwark against pauperism.

PUBLIC attention has been so authoritatively called to proposals for “Old Age Pensions” that the question cannot be left out of consideration in any general view of poor relief. The system of Old Age pensions would be a variety added to the existing modes of poor relief, and for that reason of great value as another line of defence against the miseries and dangers of pauperism. Although the suggestions which have been made have apparently in view to work upon a principle of co-operative assurance between the State and those who may contract with it, still it would essentially form part of the general provision which the country has to make against the burden of pauperism.

The poverty assurance scheme of “Old Age Pensions” will be considered here only in connection with its probable working in rural districts.

Wide general schemes are attractive by their simplicity, but they often fail in practice from want of adaptability to different local conditions of feeling and necessity. There is no reason why the principle of co-operative assurance against poverty should not primarily be varied in form to suit circumstances as they differ in urban, and in rural districts, and again further varied to meet industrial conditions as they effect wage-earning and the expectancy of life. Some elastic power is absolutely essential for the success of such a system, and consequently a *uniform general scheme* for the whole country, which must depend largely upon centralized management, would probably fail, whereas

Knowledge and faculty for adaptation to differing circumstances of locality and industry are local, not imperial.

the higher vitality and stricter local knowledge of representative County Councils would be likely to succeed. A County Council may be expected to possess a practical resourcefulness and competent working power adapted to cope with the difficulties of its own county. This plan, if developed for rural parts, would restrict the Central Department to a control over County Councils as administrative authorities, and County Councils to control over parishes as initial local agencies merely.

With regard to rural parts many reasons present themselves to recommend parishes as local agency areas for "Old Age Pensions," and the capacity and promise of a parochial agency can be grounded upon obvious considerations. Tradition, sentiment and faculty as local forces are combined in their most active form in a parish, especially in rural parishes, and under the feelings they foster among parishioners co-operation acquires a special attraction. Probably also local institutions are more kindly taken to and afford better security, because from being more in view they can be better examined, and accessibility and familiarity promote a confidence which the remote direction of State management fails to command. The strong natural inclination of the agricultural poor to make provision for themselves is attested not only by the wonderful growth of the leading friendly societies, but also by the success of county societies and the abundant support given to small local or parish clubs of various kinds as a provision against sickness and in case of death. Indeed, in many rural parts there is an extreme eagerness to form co-operative assurance societies as a protection against livelihood risks of all kinds. Village Pig Clubs for instance are very general in agricultural parishes, and depend almost entirely upon self-management by their members. They are flourishing institutions for assurance against the loss of the winter store of meat, and are consequently of so much importance, that it can be no matter for legitimate surprise if for that reason the "Pig Club" should for long continue to stand before "Old Age Pensions." The rural instinct of voluntary provision against livelihood risks ought to be utilized all the more because, as it now appears, the idea of a legal compulsion has wisely been given up.

Parishes recommended themselves for local agencies from the habit of the agricultural poor to engage in co-operative assurance against livelihood risks.

With poor relief on parish basis, parish opinion and discipline would powerfully support "Old Age Pensions."

In rural parishes the help of a sanction derived from social opinion could be obtained under a system of self-management similar to that which existed when poor relief was a parochial charge, which would be more effective than any *practicable scheme of legal compulsion*. If in a rural parish poor relief was allowed to be managed as a parish burden and responsibility, it would be to the interest of the ratepayers, as part of their self-protection against a future burden, upon the parish, to induce a general acceptance of the pension scheme, and they would appreciate its value in that aspect. *It would be made the fashion, and the smallness of the community would help to make the fashion particularly compulsive.* Any man refusing to come under the scheme would appear to be throwing an unfair risk upon his fellow parishioners, and they as ratepayers would appreciate that fact in a manner he would be made to understand. *Parish institutions would produce a continuous pressure in favour of old age assurance*, and the constant association necessary in agricultural work, with the influence of the farmers and of other employers of labour, would be sure to contribute to it. The certificate for an old age pension would become so much a passport for employment as well as for goodwill and regard in any parish in which a man lived or wished to settle, that it would be prized for its value as an evidence of respectability and steadiness. The moral compulsion so derived, must of necessity rest upon arrangements by which each parish in rural parts would enjoy a separate financial responsibility and powers of management in poor relief. If this basis for the poor relief burden were established, village opinion would soon develop to the conclusion that a man who failed, while he had the opportunity, to secure for himself an old age pension, would be rightly left to the workhouse as his resource, a tone of public feeling in which there would reside an ample compulsion.

County Council guarantee would be as effective as Imperial guarantee, and self-interested advocacy of a parish agency better than the Post Office.

The financial bearings of "Old Age Pensions" are far from being simple, but they need not concern administration. Apparently a county guarantee ought to be quite as effective as an imperial guarantee, and whether the bonus to meet the personal payment by the old age assurer or the equivalent of that bonus in a deferred liability is to be met

by an apportionment from the poor rate or from imperial taxation, the administration could in either case be entrusted to County Councils, under a general power by the Local Government Board for national control. The management would be sound in basis—that of the chief body of elect public men of the county. The fostering advocacy and push would spring from their strongest source—*where the necessities lie*. Parishes would be keenly interested in promoting “Old Age Pensions,” because they would be part profit-sharers under the system. The distribution of parishes throughout the county, and their powerful and unique influence upon the rural population, would ensure a greater success than could be hoped for from any other agency—certainly greater than from the Post Office, already overweighted and lethargic from its numerous and wide monopolies.

---

---

## PART II.

### *Chapter II.—The Parish and Public Health.*

---

THE sanitary authority for rural parishes is provided out of the existing Boards of Guardians, and a perusal of the Second Report of the Royal Sanitary Commission, 1871, shows quite clearly that the guardians were selected to act because behind them the central authority could wield enormous powers, and at the same time be relieved from responsibility and screened from popular view. A more obedient instrument for use under centralizing direction than a Board of Guardians, could hardly be wished for, while the representative character attributed to it disarms

Present Rural  
Sanitary  
Authorities  
screens for  
centralized  
direction.

much of the opposition which the direct action of a central authority is liable to encounter. The Commissioners, however, were anxious to minimise to a still greater extent all chance of interference by the poorer ratepayers; they, therefore, recommended that the number of votes for the office of guardian should rise with property to a maximum of six votes for an annual value of £250,\* and that guardians should be elected for three years instead of one. By this means it was hoped that no popular influence would be able to disturb the course of official action. What was then wanted was an unimpeded field of operation for the ever-willing army of sanitation—specialists, engineers, surveyors, and officials, actual and expectant, who were eager to go to work for the advantage of the country at large. In the words of the Sanitary Commissioners—†

One central authority “all  
“that can be  
“requisite to  
“secure complete  
“local govern-  
“ment.”

“ One central authority, with eyes enough through its inspectors  
“ to be cognizant of every negligence, and skill enough through an  
“ agency of experts to give the best advice and plans, and having full  
“ power to execute what is acknowledged to be necessary when the  
“ local executive persistently leaves it undone, is all that can be  
“ requisite to secure complete local government.”

Here we have the true ideal of official sanitation! An omniscient central government of a thousand eyes and but one brain, ubiquitous inspectors, self-contented experts, and a people so reverently and apathetically grateful, that their minds never compete with official prevision!

Arbitrary  
powers given in  
Sanitary Acts  
upon induce-  
ment of promises  
which have not  
been redeemed.

It was the promise dangled before the country to give “the best advice and plans” which extorted its consent to, and formed the pretext for the acquisition of the extraordinary powers given to the central department by the Public Health Act of 1875. *The promise, however, has not been redeemed.* Plans have not been given, and advice has been limited to such criticism as would not involve the department in responsibility. The Sanitary Commissioners, in their report, recommend that there should be created “one central authority” :—‡

“ There should be one recognized and sufficiently powerful minister,  
“ not to centralize administration, but on the contrary to set local

\*Second Report of Royal Sanitary Commission, 1871, Vol. 1, page 30.

†Second Report of Royal Sanitary Commission, 1871, Vol. 1, page 54.

‡Second Report of Royal Sanitary Commission, 1871, Vol. 1, page 31.

" life in motion—a real motive power, and an authority to be referred to for guidance and assistance by all the Sanitary Authorities for local government throughout the country. Great is the *vis inertiae* to be overcome: the repugnance to self taxation; the practical distrust of science; and the number of persons interested in offending against Sanitary laws, even amongst those who must constitute chiefly the local authorities, to enforce them."

Of course, it is easy, except for those unfortunate ratepayers whose "local life" has been "set in motion," to laugh at such an ebullition of sanitary gasconade.

There is the usual assumption that no mind can be had outside the "*one central authority*" or the "*one recognized and sufficiently powerful minister*" who is "*to set local life in motion*," or rather the marionette burlesque of local life which would be preferred by such a "*one central authority*."

*The mechanical practice of a central authority is to secure safety for itself*; it consequently does not venture to afford "guidance and assistance to Sanitary Authorities, and in the light of events we know that the *vis inertiae* and "the practical distrust of science" have proved too yielding, though "the repugnance to self taxation" still abides among that part of the population regarded by the law as capable of managing its own affairs.

*Central authority by pretence of assistance has checked local effort.*

The Commissioners of 1871\* said:—

" We do not consider the superiority of any particular mode of sewerage, e.g., whether by separate or joint discharge of sewage and surface water, sufficiently decided by general experience or opinion to be imperatively asserted by law; but there can be no doubt that every town, and even village, should have some innoxious means for the disposing of its refuse, so as to pollute neither the air breathed nor the water drunk, and, if possible, so as to turn the refuse to profitable use. 'This principle,' says Mr. Rawlinson, 'has never proved unreasonable, it is asserted in the existing law, but not carried out.' We hope the proposed inspectorial, and ultimately executive, power of the central authority will carry it out."

It was the duty of the Sanitary Commissioners of 1871 to have extracted from "general experience or opinion" the direction "to be imperatively asserted by law" in the Act of 1875, but instead of grappling with their obligation in this respect they shirked it, and by the vagueness and inflation of their report they raised hopes about the Jack-

\*Second Report of the Royal Sanitary Commission, 1871, Vol. 1, page 43.

o'-Lanthorn "PRINCIPLE" which induced the granting of powers in the Act, that have proved injurious to local self-effort. What the "Principle" really was that the Commissioners had in their minds cannot now be discerned, but we know that neither the inspectorial nor the executive authority have ventured upon a practical exposition of it, nor have they succeeded in pointing out how "*the principle which has never proved unreasonable*" should be carried into effect. The public easily become nervous and alarmed about sanitation, and this feeling gives a loose rein to arbitrary proposals. The Commissioners plainly appear to have been tempted out of their depth, for far from setting out their "*principle*," they merely gave a crystalline quality to the muddle-headed superficiality of the day in sanitary matters. By the Act of 1875 they procured an obligation, "*to be imperatively asserted by law*," which has indirectly caused "*the water drunk*" to be far more widely polluted than it used to be. Legislation based upon the shifting unreality of scientific assumptions is particularly dangerous, because it gives to error the force and respectability of law, and so tends to stifle investigation.

The centralized authority created by the Sanitary Acts has caused great loss and injury to localities, especially in matters connected with sewage disposal. In many cases the inhabitants have been forced, against their better knowledge of local facts and conditions, to carry out large and useless works, and to incur an oppressive debt for them. In consequence of the provisions of the Public Health Act, sections 15 and 22, rainfall and subsoil water cannot be excluded from a public sewerage system, *hence sewage purification is rendered impossible by any process or system*, and the fouling of the natural watercourses by discharges from sewage storm overflows, and water-logged sewage marshes continues, with results increasingly injurious to the economical and sanitary welfare of the nation. *The sanitary law is in this condition, fifteen years after the acquirement by the centralized authority of extraordinary powers for their sanitary "agency of experts."* This inexcusable default of the Sanitary Commissioners has been contentedly slumbered over by the Central Authority for very many years, and in that time it has wasted many

Public Health  
Act, 1875,  
sections 15 and  
22, has caused  
waste of millions  
upon sewage  
disposal.

millions of our local resources. It is upon powers for the separation of sewage from rainfall and subsoil water that the most important and comprehensive of all Sanitary Reforms—the disposal of sewage waste—practically depends. Hence no real progress has been possible in sewage purification, because the confused state of the law affords no safe direction or foothold with regard to the respective rights and duties of local authorities and owners and occupiers. Since the acquisition of larger powers by the Central Authority, sewage certainly passes into the natural water courses by a less direct route, but much more *completely* than before, because the inclusion of rainfall and subsoil water scours the sewers or floods the sewage farms at times of heavy rain. For the same reason the overflow and soakage from soakwells (called in Sec. IV. of the Public Health Act, 1875, “cesspools”) is also greater in amount and pollutes the water supply over a more extensive area than heretofore.

Though the Central Authority has given little help, it <sup>Inspectorism, Expertism, and Officialism of</sup> has greatly contributed to the widespread deadlock which now exists in connection with sewage purification. The “One Central Authority” <sup>have largely contributed to existing deadlock in sewage purification.</sup> pretence of assistance and the arbitrary powers have done much to paralyse the independent intelligence of the country, and to prevent its being applied to find a solution for our sewage difficulty. To an Inspector anything new is repulsive, as it seems to foreshadow trouble to come. To an Expert any truth *but his own particular pet truth* is the red rag of provocation. To an Official, uniformity appears as the one great object to be attained for the sake of departmental control and comfort, even though it should be *uniformity in ignorance*. It is no wonder that the united forces of *Inspectorism, Expertism, and Officialism* have largely succeeded in repressing individual effort to utilize scientific facts for the public benefit. There is little room to doubt that under free institutions the mind of the country, stimulated by local responsibility to work independently in our thousands of parishes, would have discovered means for sewage disposal adapted to their circumstances. Unfortunately the torpor which spreads from centralization has engendered a different condition of feeling and duty; and many persons well qualified to do good local service

and willing to acknowledge the necessity of it, refuse to serve because of the delays, the wastefulness, and the many mortifications imposed by the routine of centralization, and by the overbearing habits of official self-complacency.

**Plan of "Parish Government Bill" gives sanitary powers to parishes but supervision and control to County Councils.**

The scheme proposed by the Parish Government Bill transfers to the inhabitants of rural parishes the powers and duties hitherto exercised on their behalf by the Committee of Guardians, known as the Rural Sanitary Authority. A special Sanitary Committee, or in the absence of such Committee, then the parish Committee would (during consent of the inhabitants) act as Sanitary Authority for the parish. The Medical Officer of Health would be appointed by the County Council, and the same officer might be appointed for a number of parishes, or for a district division of the County Council. He would discharge his duties according to the Public Health Act, 1875, and also make periodical reports to the County Council, and special reports, as he might deem necessary, in cases where the inhabitants of parishes have failed to carry out the provisions of the Public Health Act of 1875. In this way matters relating to public health of rural parishes would, under parochial administration, be collectively supervised by the County Authority. The control now exercised by the Local Government Board would be transferred to County Councils, and local enquiries could, upon application by the County Authority, be conducted by the officials of the Local Government Board under an arrangement affording advantages to both the Central and the County Authorities.

## PART II.

### *Chapter III.—The Parish and Highways.*

**Two areas for highway management among rural Parishes.**

IN the rural parishes there are two areas for highway purposes, Highway Parishes and Highway Districts. The former derive their powers under the Highway Act, 1835,

and several amending Acts; the latter under the District Highways Acts, 1862 and 1864. The number of Highway Parishes separately maintaining their own highways under the Act of 1834 is about 6,203. There are 362 Highway Districts, composed of 7,886 rural parishes.

The management of the highways in the parishes under the Act of 1835 is vested in a Surveyor, appointed by the Vestry once a year, and there is power to make a separate highway rate up to 2s. 6d. in the £. In parishes with over 5,000 population the Vestry may elect a Highway Board instead of appointing a Surveyor. Highway Districts are formed by an Order of Quarter Sessions combining any number of Highway Parishes. In forming these districts sometimes the Union area and sometimes the petty sessional division have been adopted. The roads in such a district are managed by a District Highway Board composed of the justices, resident in the district, and of waywardens for each parish. The expenses are borne by a common fund raised by rates levied equally in each constituent parish or place in proportion to its rateable value according to the Poor Law valuations of the parishes composing the district, and are levied by a precept which generally goes to the overseers, who pay out of the poor rate.

The Highways Act, 1878, has given to Rural Sanitary Authorities highway powers over 619 Highway Parishes (included in the 7,886 parishes mentioned above), and a Highway District may be authorized by an order of the County Authority to exercise all the powers of a Highway Board. On such an order being made the powers and duties of an existing Highway Board pass to the Rural Sanitary Authority, who defray all highway expenses, as general sanitary expenses under the Public Health Act, 1875.

The Public Health Act also provides that the Local Government Board may, by order, vest in any Rural Sanitary Authority highway powers in respect of the whole or part of their sanitary district, and their expenses also are to be paid out of the poor rate. The Highway Act, 1878, sets out two classes of main roads:—(1.) All roads

Act of 1875,  
Highways Act,  
1878, and Public  
Health Act,  
1875, provide  
management by  
Parish Surveyor,  
Highway Board,  
District High-  
way Board, or  
Rural Sanitary  
Authority.

ceasing since 1870 to be turnpike roads, except such as the Local Government Board, on the application of the County Authority, disman by provisional order to be confirmed by Parliament:—(2.) All roads which, on the application of a Highway Authority, are declared by the County Authority to be main roads.

**Highways under  
Local Govern-  
ment Act of 1888.**

Under the Local Government Act of 1888 the County Authority (County Council) now pay out of the county rate the expenses of maintenance of a main road certified by the County Surveyor to be properly maintained by the Highway Authority. This Act also gives power to the County Authority to compel Highway Authorities to properly perform their duties, and in default the County Authority may repair the roads themselves and charge the expenses on the highway rates of the defaulting parish.

**Desirable that  
highways should  
be subject to  
Parochial  
Administration  
under County  
control.**

To substitute for so much complication of authority and of Authorities, a simple basis of management and responsibility is clearly desirable. No valid objection can be urged against control by rural parishes of their own roads, *not being main roads*. It is the inhabitants of the parish who chiefly use the local roads, and who therefore suffer most in inconvenience and in pocket if they are not properly and economically maintained. Even in cases where the inhabitants might try to save in rates by neglecting their roads, the County Surveyor would be able to apply an easy and effectual correction, because he has powers to require any work which he considers necessary to be done, and under his powers can issue a precept for the cost of carrying the work out under his direction.

**Scheme of Parish  
Government  
Bill.**

Under the scheme proposed by the Parish Government Bill, the powers and duties of existing Highway Authorities would rest in the inhabitants, who would be at liberty to appoint a Highways Committee, or to join with some other parish or parishes in appointing a Highways Committee, or if no Highways Committee be appointed, then the Parish Committee would (during consent of the inhabitants) act as Highways Committee for the parish.

## PART II.

*Chapter IV.—The Parish and Education.*

---

IN rural parishes School Boards are a rare exception. Where they do not exist, the guardians, who, for education purposes, are styled School Attendance Committees, exercise authority, and owing to the fact, which cannot be too often repeated, that the great size of rural unions, by imposing day service and long travel, greatly restricts the number of those willing to offer themselves as candidates for the Union Board, in many cases there is no choice at all, and the inhabitants find themselves without influence of practical value in connection with the carrying out of the law of compulsory attendance in their own parish.

Union Board  
useless as School  
Attendance  
Authority.

As a School Attendance Authority, the Union Board is quite incompetent. In the first place it has no time for the work: the Board has far too much to do to undertake the burdensome duties of school attendance enquiry. In the second place, the difficulties inseparable from its unmanageable area prevent the Union Board from looking after school attendance. A preliminary enquiry would have to be held in the parishes as a sort of court of first instance, for it is impossible to summon the parents before a justice until an opportunity has been given to meet the charge against them, which is often found to rest upon a very treacherous foundation. Where this indispensable duty is neglected either there is no enforcement, or complaints are made which reveal so much hardship, and appear so arbitrary that they give rise to a disinclination to enforce the law, which consequently soon falls into abeyance.

Through want  
of time and  
unmanageable  
area.

How can a rural Union Board or a District Council hold such a preliminary enquiry? The parents from distant parishes cannot come before them without in-

The Union  
cannot enquire,  
or administer, or  
attract outside  
assistance.

flicting too great a hardship from the loss of work-day time, and also because the cause of non-attendance is usually illness, helpless infants, or extreme poverty. The Union cannot go to the expense of appointing a number of officers to obtain local knowledge for it, and, if such officers were appointed, the Committee dare not then take extreme measures without some personal investigation of their own. As things stand in rural districts, school attendance so far as the Union is concerned, is generally left to take care of itself, and in what is done the information of the relieving officer is relied upon. Not only does the great size of the Union area prevent proper enquiry from being made, but as school attendance, like poor relief, demands continual supervision on the spot, the distant authority is powerless to see if its warnings have had effect. In short, the unmanageable area makes Union administration so blind, fitful and irregular, that its pressure is never honestly reckoned with; it is regarded as tyrannical and partial, and consequently evaded as a vexatious hardship would be. The Union Board has so much impressed upon it,—the aspect of a control foreign and apart from local appreciation and sympathies, that its management is never kindly taken to by a rural population; it never attracts; it cannot count upon outside assistance; it is in all its ways most repugnantly official.

Parish has  
unrivalled  
qualifications  
for perfect  
discharge of  
School atten-  
dance duties.

If the obligation to enforce compulsory attendance at school were placed upon the inhabitants of parishes a regular attendance would be secured. There is no reason to fear that the inhabitants of a parish acting in a position of authority would be indifferent to their public obligation; the basis of authority would be too wide to allow of it, and there could be no secrecy or collusion, for an independent responsibility conferred upon the whole body of the ratepayers of a rural parish must evoke constant mutual correction among them in their discharge of a public duty. Respect for the law of compulsory attendance and goodwill to its intention would also be secured by enlisting the inhabitants in its support as the authority for school attendance, and this support can only be obtained on those terms. The administration would cost nothing in salaries, but it would prove very efficient as the evidence

in every case must be quite complete from being within view and matter of common knowledge in the parish. Still more important for good school attendance than any result from coercion, would be the facility and completeness of supervision practicable within a parish boundary. It would be the supervision of the neighbourhood for self regulation, and as such would have a moral force and practical efficiency which no outside authority can ever hope to acquire. In matters connected with education, the infliction of guardian authority in any shape upon rural parishes is especially needless. It is obvious that the powers of the Education Department, as chief paymaster, and the obligations of the Education Acts, could easily be enforced upon parishes even without extending the present machinery for Government school inspection.

Parochial interest in parish schools might be effectively aroused and stimulated by the concession to the ratepayers of a share in administrative responsibility. So far as the inhabitants are concerned the present management of rural schools rests upon a totally indefensible basis. In early days when schools were created and supported by private benefactors and the clergy, there was a rough sense of justice in allowing those who paid to call the tune ; but elementary schools are now mainly supported by public money, and the management is therefore a public trusteeship. *Regarded as Trustees*, two or three persons (sometimes, however, the clergyman of the parish himself) provide a security far inferior to that which would belong to the general body of the ratepayers. With the inhabitants the regular continuity of management is certain to be preserved ; with the individual management of two or three persons, very frequently one only, illness, death, the exchange or promotion of the rector causes a dislocation and disturbance injurious to school results.

The management of one or a small number of persons not publicly accountable, may become narrow, one-sided, and lethargic, and is apt to be oppressive to the teaching staff. Their management is directed by an interest necessarily of a more abstract or sectarian character than that of the general body of the parishioners. There is no sound defence for shutting out the ratepayers from con-

Larger amount  
of public money  
now given to  
schools makes  
management  
more of public  
trusteeship.

One or more  
self-appointed  
persons provide  
management  
inferior and  
injurious as  
compared with  
parish  
management.

trol over the schools to which many of them send their children. Why should they not administer the Education Acts in their parish? The feeling of being patronised and of being managed for is sure to raise among people who are good for anything feelings of irritation and a lack of interest; whereas if the charge of the school as a public parish institution was thrown upon the ratepayers, it would lead to a responsible understanding of the value of school work and of the obligation upon the parents to give assistance to the method and discipline of school life. In short, *the schools would be their own, and as such would be regarded from a more healthy point of view.* This feeling of possession and of service as a property of the parish would also do away with any difficulty about support for the school, for as the schools would become the affair of the inhabitants, the necessities and obligations connected with them would be wholly within their view and would be met as a matter of course.

Parish management would place Education Department in far better position for control of every kind.

The most timid legislator has no reason to feel any anxiety about the consequences of such a change. Public Elementary education at the present time rests upon parishes and districts, and, as a public obligation, it is easily enforced. It would be quite as easily enforced against the ratepayers of a parish by proceeding against the parish as it is under the present system. There is no difficulty in enforcing the law against local communities, and among them all none would probably present fewer difficulties and less resistance than a rural parish. Nor is there any reason for fears about irregularities in management. All public elementary schools are under the Central Education Department, and school work and system are regulated by it with great detail; its influence is completely paramount and is kept constantly alive in schools by the visits of the inspector of the district. *The payment by attendance and by results would put upon the ratepayers a pressure they would appreciate AS MARKING RESULTS.* The transfer of authority to the inhabitants would also be a change of very great advantage to the Education Department. There are many schools which are without managers and in which the subscribers have no voice; this exclusion of parochial influence is maintained upon

the ground of a provision in the school trust deed, which, in such cases, is usually of a date anterior to the grant of any public money for elementary education. Under the existing condition of the enormous public aid now granted to such schools, to take up *the position of excluding parochial influence is most absurd*. Such a position is, however, sometimes assumed and frequently gives rise to great practical difficulty as well as to much irritation. The school management itself may be good, but management by a single individual must create elements of personal difficulty and contingencies of risk, which it may be supposed the Education Department would gladly exchange for the full responsibility and permanence of an authority resting upon a broad public basis.

To establish the inhabitants as the education authority in rural parishes would make little change where a committee of management has existed, because in a parish the same persons would necessarily be marked out by their experience and inclination for undertaking school management. Still, the change of basis would develop among the inhabitants generally an understanding and appreciation of the work of the School Committee, and such appreciation by fellow parishioners affords the most agreeable and satisfactory reward which the performance of local duty can give. It would be management *during consent of the inhabitants*, and for such duty it cannot be desired or desirable that a committee should have control *against the consent of the inhabitants*. A position of this kind, by being held during mutual consent, exercises a powerful influence for the furtherance of good mutual understanding; *the pressure is constantly felt by both parties*, and a spirit of considerate moderation is created by the knowledge that there is a complete mutual freedom capable of being exercised without any delay in taking the course which may be required by circumstances.

There can be no security against an unnecessary disruption of management so great as that presented by mutual dependence between the governors and the governed, and in rural parishes where School Boards do exist, the cumbrous and expensive machinery of an elected board for a fixed term, so far from contributing to continuity of manage-

*Continuity of  
management  
better secured  
by allowing  
inhabitants  
constant  
influence than  
by FIXED-TERM  
School Board.*

ment, on the contrary, does very much to endanger and prevent it. If control were not withdrawn from the inhabitants, then information would be furnished to them as it was required, *and knowledge and responsibility, possessed and felt by the ratepayers as a body, would secure upon its most enduring basis that continuity of management which it is so desirable to obtain.* Under the present system of election of a few for a long fixed term, something resembling *a limited despotism is created, and with it an idea of privileged authority instead of representative trust.* Partly from this cause, information is not furnished to the inhabitants, dissatisfaction is allowed to grow, and at the end of the three years' term, there is sometimes an explosion of pent-up popular indignation, which is often unjust and unmeasured, but which is, however, the direct consequence of a system that lifts off from representatives the pressure of their trust. Schemes for vitiating representation by nominating members, or by partial retirement of members, merely render the dissatisfaction of the inhabitants greater, because the effect of such complications is still further to restrict the control of the ratepayers.

Under the scheme proposed by the Parish Government Bill, the inhabitants would become the education authority in each rural parish, and exercise, and be subject to, the powers, duties and liabilities of a School Board, or of a School Attendance Committee, according to the circumstances of the parish. A Special Education Committee, or in the absence of such special committee, then the parish committee would (during consent by the inhabitants) administer the Education Acts, and ensure that arrangements for Public Elementary Education, satisfactory to the Education Department and to the inhabitants, were provided.

## PART II.

*Chapter V.—The Parish and Charity Property.*

ENDOWMENTS for public use abound in all parts of the country in great variety. The following is the preamble to 43 Eliz. c. 4:—

“Whereas land, tenements, rents, annuities, profits, hereditaments, goods, chattels, money, and stocks of money have been heretofore given, limited, appointed, and assigned, as well by the Queen and her progenitors as by sundry other well-disposed persons, some for the relief of aged, impotent and poor persons, some for maintenance of sick and maimed soldiers and mariners, schools for learning, and scholars in universities, some for the repair of bridges, fords, havens, churches, sea banks, and highways, some for the education and preferment of orphans, some for the marriages of poor maids, &c., &c., which have not been employed according to the charitable intent of the givers and founders thereof by reason of frauds, breaches of trust, &c.”

This Statute authorised the Lord Chancellor to issue Commissions into any part of the realm, under which four or more Commissioners were, *with the assistance of a jury*, to make enquiry as to any charitable gifts, and as to any abuses or breaches of trust, and also to make orders and decrees for a due and faithful employment of such charity funds. Under this Statute more than 1,000 Commissions were, from its passing to the year 1760, issued into different counties, and the inquisitions and decrees taken were filed in the Petty Bag Office of the Court of Chancery. By a series of judicial interpretations the Mortmain Acts were avoided, and gifts to corporations for charitable uses were re-established. This led to the passing of an Act, the 9 Geo. II. c. 36, by which it was enacted that no real property, or money to be laid out in the purchase of real property, should be given to any charitable use unless such gift be executed by deed at least twelve months before the donor's death, and enrolled in Chancery within six months of its execution.

Statutory  
Endowments  
and Commission  
of Enquiry  
issued before the  
present century.

In 1786 an Act was passed (26 Geo. III. c. 58, s. 4) requiring the ministers, churchwardens, and overseers of every parish in England to return on oath an account of all charitable donations which had been given by deed or will for the benefit of the poor persons within such respective parishes. Out of 13,000 parishes, from which returns had been required, all save 14 made returns, and these disclosed very unsatisfactory results.

Lord Brougham's and other Commissions of Enquiry leading to Charitable Trusts Act, 1853.

Lord Brougham's Commission was appointed in 1818, and remained in office till July, 1837. Its reports dealt with upwards of 28,000 charities, and gave full information as to all the charitable trusts in the country.

Four other Commissions were appointed between 1813 and 1835, and the abuses of charity administration brought about the passing of the Charitable Trusts Act, 1853, by which the Charity Commissioners were appointed with functions relating to charities similar to those theretofore discharged by the Court of Chancery. Since that Act, non-contentious business in connection with charities has been supervised by the Charity Commissioners, contentious matters having still been left to be enquired into by the Court of Chancery by way of information on the certificate of the Attorney-General.

Various other Acts for the better regulation of charities have also been passed during the last 80 years.

Existing supervision and general powers of the Charity Commissioners.

The Charity Commissioners, by an Act passed in 1860 (23 and 24 Vic. c. 136), were given large judicial powers, but they had no jurisdiction over cases where the income of the charity exceeded £50, except upon application made to them by a majority of the trustees of the charity, and it has been calculated that this restriction applies to the charities of the Kingdom in the proportion of 85 per cent. of their aggregate value, but only to 10 per cent. of their total number.

The practical result of the Acts of 1853 and 1860 has, however, been to gradually give all supervision and initiatory jurisdiction to the Charity Commissioners.

There is a power of appeal to the Court of Chancery, but the average annual number of appeals were only seven between 1862 and 1871; and from that time they

have so dwindled that in the interval between 1876 and 1887 only one application was made. It may, therefore, be assumed that the general control over charities is now in the hands of the Charity Commissioners.

Under the powers at present provided by the Parish Government Bill, it is only the administration of the few charities which have not been dealt with that would pass to the inhabitants of the rural parishes concerned. In the great majority of rural parish charities their employment and basis of management have already been approved by the Court of Chancery or by the Commissioners. Without, however, interfering with schemes which have settled the appropriation of charity property or income, means might be devised for transferring the administration of charities to the inhabitants of the rural parishes concerned in them. The inhabitants can be made as conveniently and as summarily responsible to the Charity Commissioners as any other body which could be devised for management, whatever the mode by which it might be appointed or renewed for that purpose. No doubt can exist as to the great general advantage and satisfaction that would arise from allowing the inhabitants to have an effective voice in the administration of their parish charity funds. It is the only means by which they can practically acquire knowledge of their charities and of the duties connected with them. The want of such a clear understanding is really at the root of most of the discontent about the administration of parish trusts, and this ignorance could not continue if the pressure of management were placed upon the inhabitants themselves.

By the present management of charity funds and property by trustees or by the minister, churchwardens, or overseers of the parish, under old Trust Deeds, much dissatisfaction is caused. The inhabitants have practically no control over trustees so appointed, and as to the parish officers, one churchwarden is appointed by the minister, and both overseers are in law appointed by the justices.

What evil could arise from administration by a committee appointed by the ratepayers? A complete light would always be thrown upon their proceedings, because

these must be sanctioned in open vestry, with the knowledge of all. No better check can be had than that applied in open meeting by shareholders in a public trust. In addition, there would be the proper audit and power of appeal to the Charity Commissioners, who, under such conditions of publicity, would have no difficulty in arriving at a full knowledge of local feeling and circumstances.

**Management of  
Parish Charities  
according to  
Parish Govern-  
ment Bill.**

No interference is proposed with the powers exercised by the Charity Commissioners or by the High Court, but under the scheme proposed by the Parish Government Bill, with regard to all Charities vested in the Churchwardens and overseers not dealt with by a scheme framed by the Court or the Commissioners, the property left for the benefit of the inhabitants would vest in them, and be administered in accordance with the Trusts by a Special Charities Committee, or in the absence of such special committee, then the Parish Committee would (during consent of the inhabitants) manage the charities of the parish.

## PART II.

### *Chapter VI.—The Parish and Allotments.*

**Union Boards  
useless for  
provision of  
allotments.**

VERY little use has been made of the Allotments Act, 1887, and its comparative failure shows that the Board of Guardians is wanting in the qualities of sympathy and faculty to meet popular requirements.

Allotments are of great value to the labouring poor, but if allotments are to be obtained, those who want them should have power to put in motion the requisite machinery.

The Union Board is useless for this purpose ; it is too remote from the parishes ; the labourers have no influence upon Union Boards, and it is impossible for their wishes to find a direct expression upon them. If a Guardian proposes to put the Allotments Act into operation in his own parish, the Guardians of other parishes may be moved to thwart the application from prejudice, or fear that allotments will work adversely to their own interests as employers of rural labour. How far this prejudice or fear really exists may be open to question, but it cannot be disputed that the Allotments Act, 1887, has not realized the expectations formed about it. It has almost entirely failed. In parish details about allotments, the Union Board must be ignorant, and, at the best is likely to be indifferent, even if it is not actively hostile to their general principle.

The failure of the Act of 1887 in direct working power cannot be disputed. The very production of the Bill of 1890 was an admission of the fact, for, though the Bill of 1890 was called an Appeal Bill, that title rather conceals than describes its real object, which was to supersede and not merely to correct the action of the lower authority. The Rural Sanitary Authority had failed, partly because it was impossible to put it in possession of the full and intimate information demanded, and partly because the persons interested (country labourers) cannot spare the time or meet the cost of putting the remote and sluggish Union Board into motion. The Guardians had made few attempts to work the Act of 1887, and it was sought to appease the general disappointment by introducing another authority and giving it powers in considerable variety for working the Act. The appeal purpose was quite a subordinate one, the main intention being to introduce a fresh authority for independent administration.

The principal causes of failure in the 1887 (Guardians) Bill were quite apparent.

(1.) The meeting times and the meeting places of the Union Authorities made them difficult of access to the parishioners.

(2.) The large area of Poor Law Rural Unions by making local knowledge of the requisite sort

Causes of failure  
in both 1887  
and 1890 Acts  
the same.

impossible to the guardians, rendered them apathetic and indifferent in a matter of such strictly local interest as allotments.

There can hardly be any reasonable doubt that the sole chance of giving life to any measure for creating allotments depends upon a frank establishment of *sufficient powers in parishes, where alone the personal interest for initiative and the local knowledge for administration are to be found.* But instead of taking that obvious course, the characteristic dread, which Departmental Officialism always has of *open popular powers* had apparently inspired a ridiculous scheme of legislative stultification.

For though the causes of failure in the 1887 (Guardians) Bill were unmistakable, by the new 1890 (County Council) Bill Parliament was invited to plunge *ten times more deeply into precisely the same mistakes.* Because:—

(1.) The County Councils meet far more rarely, and their meeting places are far more remote and difficult of access than in the case of the Union Authorities.

(2.) The County area is far larger as compared with its Union areas, and the pressure of its weighty business must make County Councillors still more apathetic and indifferent about allotment details than the Guardians had shown themselves to be.

(3.) The County Council also compare unfavourably with the Unions, because in their case one member is elected for a district of several rural parishes and for *three* years, whereas in Union Authorities every parish has its member, or more than one, and they are elected *every* year.

The larger the authority, the more intricate its machinery, and the more remote its situation, the greater is the necessity, in order to succeed, that professional assistance should be employed.

**Large areas with their unavoidable centralization make machinery intricate and costly.** Sub-section C. of section IV. of the 1890 Bill requires County Councils to keep separate accounts, to collect rents, and to become the occupiers of allotments, all this as

occasion may demand in any one of the parishes under a County Council.

To imagine the working of this Bill of 1890 is to bring into view a vast bureau of officialism, enormous by its mass and almost unchecked in its dealing with local interests, Inspectors, with their reports, Surveyors, Lawyers, great expense everywhere, and the crushing of small local efforts under heavy official overloading.

That which was to be expected under such conditions has really occurred. Up to the present time (March, 1893) the Act has proved an unqualified failure, for practically nothing has been done with it by County Councils.

The attention and time bestowed upon the Act during the Session of 1890 serves to show how impotent for good Parliament can be when devising intricate machinery and regulations for matters rightly depending upon local initiative and arrangement.

The real remedy obviously was to give the ratepayers of parishes power to hire, lease, or purchase land, by consent among themselves and with the owner under any restrictions thought necessary. How could such a power have proved unfair or injurious? What possible harm could have resulted from allowing the ratepayers by agreement among themselves to hire, purchase, or lease land for allotments as a parish transaction by a committee of parishioners appointed in their open vestry?

The labouring poor have in some cases met in parish vestry to protest against the wrong done to them, and to make their disappointment known. The traditional habits of healthy local practice instinctively guided them to that course. The vestry ought to be utilized to carry out the Act in the rural parishes, *where the circumstances are fully known to everyone*, and, consequently can be discussed with common knowledge and with power of correction by appeal to that common knowledge.

The inhabitants are on the spot, and they have that knowledge of the ground which is of extreme importance for equitable accommodation between allotment tenants.

Obvious course  
to give power  
where know-  
ledge and  
interest lie  
because precise  
appreciation of  
local facts is an  
absolute neces-  
sity.

Parishes have  
the needed pro-  
pulsive force.

In parishes the strong interest which allotments possess, as a personal affair, gives the needed propulsive force to initiate and proceed with all the arrangements. It is the want of this propulsive force that prevents both the union authorities and the County Councils from entering upon the work with which Parliament has entrusted them.

County Councils  
would bene-  
ficially exercise  
various powers  
of Court of  
Control over  
Parishes.

County Councils might, however, very conveniently have been required to examine parish proposals about creating allotments and to audit allotment accounts, their approval being properly imposed as a sanction necessary for prudential control, and to maintain legality in parish proceedings.

In disputes connected with allotments County Councils would have assisted as a court of conciliation and arbitration, and in the enforcement of legal powers for compulsory acquisition of land for allotments, their weight and authority would have protected rural parishes. Still, if the ratepayers had power of entering into voluntary agreements to purchase or hire land for allotments, with a right of appeal in case of their failing to arrange by consent, then the pressure arising out of such right of appeal to the County Council would procure a satisfactory and neighbourly arrangement in nine cases out of ten.

Upon the general question of the occupation of land by labourers, the Poor Law Commissioners say:—\*

“ We directed our Assistant Commissioners to inquire in each parish into the mode in which the occupation of land by labourers had been effected. The following are extracts from some of their reports on this subject:—”

“ Mr. Okeden, after stating that there is scarcely a parish in Wiltshire or Dorsetshire, in which the labourer has not the use of land, concludes his remarks on that subject in the following words:—

“ ‘ The allotment of land to labourers divides itself into two chief points: first, as to that quantity of land just sufficient for the cultivation of a labourer and his family, during their spare hours; and, secondly, as to that larger quantity, which requires to be worked by the assistance of others, or by the entire dedication of the labourer’s time. The day is not long past, since, in every industrious cottage family, the wheel and the distaff, the shuttle and the knitting-needles, were in full activity. At present, to

\*Poor Law Commissioners’ First Report, 1834, page 109.

“ “ compete with machinery, would be a useless waste of time, money  
“ “ and labour. We must, however, see if the hours formerly devoted  
“ “ to manufacture may not be profitably applied, and the habits of  
“ “ industry created. I cannot suggest any mode of doing so more  
“ “ profitably to the agricultural labourer and his family, than the  
“ “ cultivation of exactly that quantity of land which will occupy  
“ “ these hours as well as his own spare time. This quantity is calcu-  
“ “ lated to be one-sixteenth part of an acre, or ten lug or rods to each  
“ “ individual capable of work.” ”

After some calculations, now out of date, about farming Mr. Okeden.  
profits, Mr. Okeden's report proceeds :—

“ The allotment of larger portions of land than ten rods to an  
“ individual has this evil—if the labourer cultivates it himself with  
“ only the aid of his family, he over-forces his strength, and brings to  
“ his employer's labour a body exhausted by his struggle.

“ This I have witnessed, and of this I have heard frequent com-  
“ plaints.

“ But let us consider a still more enlarged allotment, one which  
“ will occupy the *whole* time of the man and his family to obtain  
“ support. The labourer then becomes a petty farmer, without  
“ capital, working land inadequately manured and half cultivated, and  
“ yielding, of course, insufficient crops as the return of fruitless  
“ exertions. Nor is this the only evil of the large allotments; a  
“ hovel, perhaps, is erected on the land, and marriage and children  
“ follow. In a few years more the new generation will want land,  
“ and demand will follow demand, until a cottier population, similar  
“ to that of Ireland, is spread over the country, and misery and pauperism  
“ are everywhere increased.”

Another Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Majendie, reports Mr. Majendie.  
on the acquisition of land by labourers as follows :—\*

“ The effect is invariably beneficial; their character and conduct  
“ seem immediately raised by having means of exerting themselves in  
“ some other mode, in addition to the uncertain demand for labour.  
“ It is contrary to the principles of human nature that labourers  
“ should be happy and contented when they are turned off at short  
“ notice to the parish roads or gravel pit, or degraded by what they  
“ term convict-labour, while land immediately before their eyes is  
“ passing out of cultivation.

“ There is no class in society whose feelings and opinions are so  
“ much known to each other as labourers; it can be no secret to them  
“ that the crops which may be raised by their exertions on small plots  
“ of land are infinitely greater than those produced by ordinary culti-  
“ vation. The denial of land to them will constantly produce an  
“ increase of ill-feeling on their part. It is to the proprietors that  
“ they must look for this boon; and it seems probable that nothing

\* Poor Law Commissioners' First Report, 1834, page 110.

---

"can more effectually tend to restore the good feeling which formerly prevailed between the different classes of society than the allotment system, under prudent regulations."

The prudence of allotment regulations and their workable quality will depend upon their adaptation to the actual circumstances of each case, and allotments have special features of detail in almost every parish to which routine regulations would not apply without waste and inconvenience.

Boards of  
Guardians and  
Standing  
Committees of  
County Councils  
too isolated and  
remote for  
management or  
for help.

As is pointed out by the Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Okeden, there are many dangers connected with allotments, especially from the absorption of several holdings into one and the attraction or retention of too large a population upon the land. To prevent such abuses, the management *must be on the spot*, stimulated by *self-interest* and *deriving power from knowledge fully supplied by a constant view of the facts*. Ratepayers, in their parishes, have all the qualifications; Boards of Guardians or Standing Committees of County Council have none of them. For while the Ratepayers are able to appoint from among themselves an Allotment Committee, such selection by fellow-parishioners and neighbours being accepted, and rightly so, as a compliment to a man in any position, the same course is practically *not open* to a Board of Guardians or a Standing Committee of County Council, and power, however elastic or extensive it may be made, to appoint local committees, will not help them. They cannot exercise such a power, for they do not know the people of the parish, and cannot know whom to appoint for the best. Their selection must be haphazard, and, under such circumstances, would bear an aspect of impertinence rather than of compliment. This is a state of things which is connected with the greatest of the many evils arising from centralization. In its weakness from local ignorance, it is forced to lean upon secret, partial, and one-sided information; its action tends to be craven and jealous, to create informers and diffuse the habits of informers; whereas parish work is based upon co-operation with open action, and *thereby develops the frank, free, and mutually respecting habits which invigorate public action and keep it pure.*

Under the scheme proposed by the Parish Government Bill, the inhabitants would acquire power to provide allotments, and to control the tenancy thereof, and would possess all the powers of a Sanitary Authority under the Allotments Act, 1887. The Bill provides for a Special Allotments Committee, or, in the absence of such Special Committee, then the Parish Committee would (during consent of the inhabitants) act in all matters concerning Allotments.

---

## PART III.

## WHAT IS WANTED.

*The Objects to be Secured by a Parish Government Bill.*

THE scheme suggested by the Parish Government Bill has for its chief purposes:—

- (1.) To establish *one* local authority only under the County, having power to rate and borrow money for all local purposes upon the property of owners and occupiers.
- (2.) To establish *one* area for every purpose of local self-management within the county.
- (3.) To establish direct control and self-management by the inhabitants in their own local affairs.
- (4.) To establish supervision and remedial control over rural parishes by their County Councils, and to transfer to these certain powers now exercised by the Local Government Board.

*Division I.—One Rating Authority.*

Extravagance  
only preventable  
by placing  
expenditure and  
taxation under  
one responsi-  
bility.

That a true economy would be promoted by concentrating in one body only (under the county) the powers of rating and borrowing, and the responsibility for all local expenditure, can hardly be disputed. The rapid growth of local expenditure is becoming a national risk. The ratepayers are not wanting in the will to deal with that risk, but they are unable to protect themselves, owing to the complication of many local authorities with powers independently of, and apart from, one another, to spend money, to cause

rates to be levied, and to borrow money upon the rateable value of the property of the inhabitants.

Some of the borrowing powers of local authorities extend to two years' rateable value; with others there is no statutory limitation; but in all cases the property of the inhabitants is pledged as a security for loans effected by different authorities, acting without knowledge of one another, and without any connection in responsibility. It is only a natural consequence of such a state of things that the expenditure of local authorities, within the same area, should tend to rise competitively, and that no direct influence for economy can be brought to bear upon them. The different authorities are properly anxious to promote the public purposes in their charge, but they feel comparatively little ambition to present the most modest among the rival claims upon the ratepayers. If one authority spends heavily, the others are rather encouraged than deterred by the example. It is difficult for the ratepayers to obtain a clear understanding of local liabilities and expenditure. Extravagance there must be, because no practical responsibility for expenditure can exist where there is NO ONE POWER having the obligation imposed upon it to proportion supply to meet the different local claims, according to their respective urgency and necessity, and to regulate local expenditure in the aggregate, so as to protect the ratepayer against an imprudent amount of local taxation. The audit exercised by the Local Government Board, enquires into the lawfulness of local expenditure, and is of service, but such an audit could be directed with far greater convenience by a County Council over the authorities subordinate to itself in the county.

The audit of the Local Government Board is, however, assumed to be much more than a mere check upon the unlawfulness of expenditure, and the inaccuracy of account keeping; it is also supposed in some way to prevent frauds and to promote economy. It does not require much reflection to see that such an assumption has scarcely any reasonable foundation to rest upon. How, for instance, can a Local Government Auditor, without local knowledge, by a few hours' examination, detect frauds in the year's labour account of a local authority? In what way is it

Powers over one purse independently exercised by different authorities must induce competitive expenditure.

Local Government Board audit pretends much but can effect little.

possible for such an audit to promote economy? The expenditure has taken place, and has been provided for. The figures represent nothing to the Auditor of the Local Government Board. Some petty surcharge upon a member or several members of a local authority is frequently made, but it is usually surrendered when its purpose of marking the audit has been served.

Is power to  
borrow up to  
two years  
possessed sepa-  
rately by each of,  
or collectively  
between, local  
authorities of a  
district?  
No reliable  
answer can be  
given.

The control supposed to exist in the Central Department over the borrowing powers of local authorities, is a still more ridiculous and mischievous pretence. There are several independent authorities, each with power to borrow with assent of the Local Government Board up to two years' annual rateable value, and several others with unlimited borrowing powers. Is this power to borrow up to two years' annual value, possessed *separately* as an independent faculty by each of the local authorities, or is it a right possessed between the local authorities in common, to be proportionately divided among them upon some mysterious principle, or arbitrarily without any pretence of system? In fact, the Local Government Board does not know, and no one knows, whether local authorities are entitled to share in a general borrowing power restricted to a limit of two years' annual rateable value among them, or whether they can independently lay their separate loads upon the ratepayers of  $2 \text{ years} + 2 \text{ years} + 2 \text{ years}$ , and with the further addition from authorities with unlimited borrowing powers of  $x + x + x$ .

Consent of Local  
Government  
Board for  
borrowing is a  
snare.

Of course it will be said that consent for borrowing must be obtained from the Local Government Board. In what way this sham guarantee will really work, it is for the future to disclose, because longer experience is required; still of one thing we can be certain, that any power over the expenditure or borrowing powers of local authorities, assumed to be exercised as an economical restraint, must prove misleading and utterly worthless as a security for the ratepayers. Suppose a limit attempted to be imposed upon some local authority, already burdened by charges touching the restrictive limit (and it is only by such cases that the limitation power of the Local Government Board can usefully be tested), could the

Local Government Board refuse permission to borrow for works indispensable for the health of the district? Costly sewage works to carry out schemes sanctioned, even practically imposed, by the Central Authority, have turned out to be utter failures, and the victimized ratepayers have had to replace them by other costly schemes. In such a case, how could the President of the Local Government Board refuse permission to borrow? On the contrary, *the arbitrary limit could not stand in the way*, and he would be obliged to make an endeavour to overcome any difficulties existing in the law to obtain the necessary permission for the Local Authority to borrow.

True local economy must always depend upon *the quality of the local administration*, not upon the treacherous pretence of wisdom and faculty to be exercised by a Central Department. The inhabitants have local knowledge of their parish, not *report made* nor *inspector made*, but a real local knowledge of the matters within sight and touch affecting local welfare. They have the greatest possible stimulus of self interest to use this knowledge for their own advantage and protection, and the ratepayers can do far more to protect themselves if allowed to do so than any centralized interference and official mockery of prudence can do for them.

If the members of a large family should each by independent right, careless about their respective spending, draw upon the same banking account, we should expect extravagance and disaster. The existing system of local finance is quite equally devoid of responsibility. Indeed no arrangement could be more absurdly provocative of extravagance, for expenditure is stimulated by some natural jealousy among the various local administrations having independent powers of spending. The paramount consideration that all claims have to be satisfied from but one resource—the ratepayer's pocket—is never recognised in the only way which would be effectual, *by drawing all demands into view and uniting them under one responsibility*. Under the Parish Government Bill this would be done by an arrangement resembling the system of Treasury control over the estimates of Government departments. The Treasury deals with the

True local economy depends upon knowledge of inhabitants.

Instead of independent taxing and spending authorities, parish expenditure should be drawn to one focus for forecast and regulation under Parish Budget.

estimates of the departments as aids to a general control, and the departments are bound by its control. In the same way the Bill proposes that the parish committee should collect the estimates of the various parish administrations for poor relief, sanitary matters, education, highways, together with the other parish obligations either existing or proposed to be incurred, and prepare therefrom a *Parish Budget of estimates and ways and means* to present to the inhabitants at their Easter and Michaelmas vestries. By means of this Parish Budget, the inhabitants would at *one view* and at *one time* be placed in possession of the total parish expenditure proposed for the half-year under separate heads, and they would by such a system be able to compare, proportion, and *really control* their expenditure according to the respective urgency and necessity of the various demands upon them. What can a mere audit do to promote economy? There is no life in it, for it comes too late, the mischief has been done; the audit is, therefore, stamped with helplessness and produces impotent complaint but no remedial result. On the other hand the Parish Budget would provide a system of *forecast* by which comparison and enquiry could be made when they are still effectively useful for safeguard and economy, *before* the things have been done and not *afterwards*. Thus the *Parish Budget* would enable the ratepayers to hold their expenditure in hand *as its masters*, instead of being dragged after it, complaining but helpless.

Parish to govern  
its expenditure  
and taxation,  
under control of  
County Council.

By the Parish Government Bill, the powers of these independent authorities would cease, and ratepayers acting by their Parish Committee, as the PARISH TREASURY AUTHORITY, would have sole authority under the county to spend money, to rate and borrow money upon the security of the property of the inhabitants. By sub-section 6 of section 25 a safeguard is created, giving a minority the right of appeal to the County Council against any rate for illegal or unnecessary purposes. The Bill also provides that the County Council of the county to which the parish belongs shall take over the duties, at present exercised by the Local Government Board, of local audit and of sanction for local borrowing.

*Objects to be secured by a Parish Government Bill.*

*Division II.—One Area.*

THE second object of the Parish Government Bill is, that of establishing one area for every purpose of local self-management within the County. Much confusion arises from the complex entanglement of local areas within which the different authorities at present carry out their duties. As many as twelve may at one time be exercising authority within a rural parish.

To establish one area only within County.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overseers.</li> <li>2. Guardians.</li> <li>3. Justices.</li> <li>4. Burial Boards.</li> <li>5. School attendance Committee or School Board.</li> <li>6. Highway Board or Highway Surveyors.</li> <li>7. County Council.</li> <li>8. Rural Sanitary Authority.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Vestry or Select Vestry (Watching and Lighting Acts), Public Library.</li> <li>10. Allotments Committee.</li> <li>11. Committee appointed by Vestry in any Parish over 10,000, or combined Parishes for Labouring Classes Acts, with power to build new lodging houses.</li> <li>12. Ditto under Baths and Wash-houses Acts.</li> </ol> |
|--|---|

A Parish Government Bill should provide that the parishes shall be established as separate areas for every purpose of local self-management, with power to the inhabitants of parishes to agree on joint action for their common benefit. By the Local Government Act, 1888, County Councils have power to alter boundaries, to subdivide a parish, or unite two or more parishes. The existing powers for the alteration of boundaries and adjustment of parishes are those conferred on the Local Government Board by 39 & 40 Vict., c. 61, ss. 1-9, 42 & 43 Vict., c. 54, and 45 & 46 Vict., c. 58. The order is made after such enquiry in the locality, and such notice to the Local Government Board, as are prescribed by sec. 87 of the Act of 1888. By means of this section there is provided a mode

Parishes with existing powers to unite or subdivide can furnish convenient areas for all local needs.

of uniting two or more parishes in cases where such a course may be found desirable or convenient, and where arrangements for joint action between such parishes is not the best solution of any difficulties which may be experienced in the locality.

---

*Objects to be secured by a Parish Government Bill.*

---

*Division III.—Direct Self-Management by the Ratepayers.*

---

Why should not  
ratepayers have  
direct control?

THE third object of reform in Rural Local Government is to establish direct control and self-management by the inhabitants in the local affairs of their parish. Why should they not have that control? Can it be said that there exist anywhere a better right and a better qualification than they possess? The inhabitants used to have control, and the nation has mainly grown upon the self-reliance and resourcefulness which local independence developed.

Why fear their  
direct manage-  
ment of local  
affairs?

The nature of the fear which inspires so much distrust in the management by ratepayers of their own parish affairs is worthy of examination. That such management should be, almost as a matter of course, vehemently opposed by the officials of central departments, and by doctrinaires and schemers, eager for the open field which the centralization of local government would afford, is only to be expected. But where can popular self-government, under any conditions, present so good a security as the direct self-management of local affairs in a small area provides? The ratepayers have full opportunity for a clear knowledge of their parish affairs, since those affairs are in their sight, and they have every inducement to take advantage of their knowledge, because any bad manage-

ment clearly brings its penalty in loss of credit, or comfort, or property, upon themselves. The jealous hostility of centralization to the traditional rights of ratepayers has, from time to time, caused much independence to be filched from them upon pretexts of incapacity, which are entirely without foundation. Direct self-management where it has had freedom and fair play, has surpassed every other sort of local administration in efficiency and prudence ; indeed no one attempts to deny that ratepayers are prudent in expenditure, and avoid debt, a sagacity which is at the root of all lasting prosperity.

It would have appeared useless to recommend the principle of direct self-management in its application to the general local concerns of the inhabitants if the responsibility for the break down of the old poor laws could truly be charged upon the open vestry system. In the chapter upon "Parish and Poor Relief" (*ante*, p. 36) I have shown how completely unfounded in fact those imputations are. It can be completely proved that, while direct self-management in INDEPENDENT OPEN VESTRY existed throughout the country, there was efficiency and sound economy in poor relief, a state of matters which lasted for not much short of 200 years. It was only when intermeddling under a system of centralized control was introduced by legislation, that the management of poor relief became ruinously destructive to the morals, the industry and faculties of self-support among the poor, while the burden from rating rapidly rose in its general average over the whole kingdom. The rise in the general average of rating would have been much greater but for the fact that the old system continued to maintain itself in some parishes. In the parts where centralization had most sway, the immorality and recklessness of administration grew to be very subversive and paralysing in their general influences, and the rates in some places became so intolerable that property ceased to make any return, its cultivation and ownership being almost abandoned.\*

The legislation of interfering with local management was entirely uncalled for, and the lightness of the poor

Independent  
open vestry  
managed poor  
relief with  
extraordinary  
success.

Local Self-  
government  
versus  
Centralization.

\* See case of Cholesbury Poor Relief, page 91.

rate burden gave proof of it; but the very lightness of that burden enabled rein to be given to sympathetic considerations congenial to the abstract views about poor relief which then prevailed. Such irresponsible sentimentality was at that time unchecked by experience or by any adequate realization of the extreme gravity of the subject, and consequently many opportunities were taken advantage of for weakening popular right and local independence. The results upon poor relief management were those which may always be expected to follow an application of the methods of centralization in local affairs. Toulmin Smith, a valued constitutional writer, truly describes centralization \* “as *“that system of government under which the smallest number of minds, and those knowing the least and having the fewest opportunities of knowing it, about the special matter in hand, and having the smallest interest in its well working, have the management of it or control over it.”*” And the same writer concisely describes local self-government “*“as that system of government under which the greatest number of minds, and those knowing the most and having the fullest opportunities of knowing it, about the special matter in hand, and having the greatest interest in its well working, have the management of it, or control over it.”*” That Toulmin Smith has not less accurately than concisely contrasted the opposed systems of centralization and local self-government is proved whenever a candid and complete examination into them is carried out.

**Illustration of old basis of open vestry, its methods, meetings, and general work of local self-government.**

As a good illustration may furnish not only proof but also that which is equally important—an understanding, of the common practice pursued in the practical working of self-government, I have referred to the minutes of my own parish of Finchley, to show the capable and orderly methods pursued in regard to poor relief and general parish management down to the time when it was taken out of the hands of open vestry by the new poor law. The administration of poor relief was necessarily an important portion of parish business, but the record shows the courage, sagacity, unity and promptitude with which the inhabitants in their open vestry answered every demand

\*Toulmin Smith Local Self-Government, page 12.

made from within or without, and also the respect then universally accorded to the vestry as both the source and the vehicle of local authority. Finchley parish is in area about 3,300 acres, and during the last half of the 18th century it had a population of about 900. *Without any ecclesiastical motive, but purely for the greater convenience and strictness of administration in secular affairs,* the inhabitants themselves had divided the parish into two parts, collecting the rates and administering poor relief separately, with separate churchwarden and overseer for each division of the parish. From a perusal of the vestry minutes, the leading features of parochial self-management can be ascertained, and they establish that :—

(1.) The inhabitants of a rural parish had sole authority for administration, and for everything belonging to the parish, including the churchyard and the fabric and furniture of the church.

(2.) The churchwardens (both of them) and the overseers were chosen by the inhabitants, the overseers so chosen obtaining a warrant of appointment under hand and seal from the magistrates.

(3). The vestry meetings were usually held in accordance with the statutory obligation of the 43rd Elizabeth, Section 2, about poor relief, “IN THE CHURCH OF THE SAID PARISH UPON SUNDAY IN THE AFTERNOON AFTER DIVINE SERVICE.”

(4). As might have been expected, FROM THE TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING, the inhabitants in vestry were all of them equal in right; their deliberations aimed at securing a common consent for whatever was decided upon, and if this common consent could not be obtained, the matter was adjourned.

The business transacted at vestry dealt with all matters of parish welfare :—

(a.) With the administration of poor relief.

(b.) With all expenditure, and details of parish accounts.

(c.) With the administration of parish charity funds.

- 
- (d.) With repairs and maintenance of highway.
  - (e.) With the maintenance and increase of the fabric and furniture of the church.
  - (f.) With the protection and regulation of its waste lands and roadside land.
  - (g.) With action necessary to sustain the rights of parishioners' ancient privileges by charter or by custom.
  - (h.) With the preservation of the peace.
  - (i.) And the vestry gave answer in the name of the parish to all demands made upon the inhabitants by the law, by all constituted authorities, or by private individuals.

**COMMON CONSENT  
the marked  
feature of vestry  
action.**

The old parish institutions evidently considered a common agreement a necessity for their action. They were framed for it, and as their practice was to sift all details of fact in their open vestry, where the knowledge of all could be appealed to for immediate and convincing correction, hardly any opportunity was given for differences of opinion, or for the party animosities which arise out of ignorance and are protected by it. In right and in interest the parishioners stood upon an equal footing, and as the local knowledge would be complete, the general circumstances of vestry evidently tended to suppress party and faction and to promote the "common consent," which is the most marked feature of the old system of self action in parish affairs.

**Miserable sub-  
stitution of  
"plebiscite"  
voting for direct  
practical powers.**

Rural Boards of Guardians, though extremely dependent upon the central department, have been made practically independent of control by the ratepayers, and consequently that corrective power which the personal interest and sound appreciation of local facts by the inhabitants was able to supply has now been lost. In exchange for the plastic practical freedom of our old local habits and institutions, with their publicity and a power reserved to the general body of the ratepayers to rectify mistakes or abuses at any moment, our modern system has substituted the contemptible privilege of electing a few men by election voting under the gambling conditions of a "plebiscite" upon personal and party grounds.

The Parish Government Bill provides that the powers of various local authorities in a parish shall be transferred to the ratepayers of such parish, who shall elect, at Easter in every year, a Parish Committee, and also at any time such other Committees as may be deemed requisite for the transaction of parish business, but the Parish Committee is to act for the Parish in all matters for which such separate Committees may not be appointed.

---

---

*Objects to be Secured by a Parish Government Bill.*

---

*Division IV.—Decentralization by the Agency of County Councils.*

---

THE idea embodied in the Parish Government Bill is that of conferring independent powers of self-management upon rural parishes to be exercised by them under the supervision and remedial control of the County Council of the county to which the parish may belong. It is, indeed, difficult to imagine a scheme for conferring considerable powers upon rural parishes which should not at the same time establish in County Councils a sufficient power for acting as remedial courts in matters requiring the intervention of a higher authority. Such a court for the assistance of parishes would be frequently required for sanction and for appeal. The borrowing of money, questions touching disagreement between parishes, or of co-operative arrangements for working, and also many matters of complaint by individuals against parish action could be considered and disposed of by the County Council. *There is no necessity for any authority intermediate between the counties and their parishes, but a natural connection in adminis-*

If powers for self-management be given to parishes, their County Councils must connect with them for supervision and control.

*tration by way of sanction and remedial appeal ought to be created, first from parishes to their County Council, and secondly from County Council to the Central Authority of Government.* It needs no elaborate setting forth of reasons to show that County Councils ought to become important agencies for decentralization ; indeed, part of the way has been opened up by the 10th section of the Local Government Act of 1888, which provides machinery for transferring obligations hitherto resting upon some departments of the Central Government. The old quarter sessions administration did its work well, but its non-representative character presented an insuperable obstacle to any large development of it as a county authority, with enlarged powers of administration and control. The new County Council stands in a very different position, and as the members generally live within their districts, they are likely to keep the inhabitants in a familiar and understanding connection with the work of the Council, and to have the claims and grievances of their district pressed upon them to present to the Council.

Supervision by  
Local Govern-  
ment Board over  
thousands of  
Parishes  
impracticable.

Under the existing system if powers of self management were conferred upon parishes, an impossible load of regulation and appeal from thousands of separate parish administrations would be thrown upon the Local Government Board : its machinery and the number of its officials would have to be enormously increased, and the dead-weight of official oppression would become all the more intolerable, because the ignorance about local conditions in individual parishes would be far greater in a Central Government Department than it is in the unions. It was the difficulty of dealing with so great a number of individual authorities which formally led to the lumping together of any number up to 80 parishes as a poor law union.

Parliament now  
too overloaded  
to check official  
abuses in De-  
partments of  
Central Govern-  
ment, though  
they cannot be  
otherwise  
repressed.

A further and most important reason why no direct control by a Government Department over parishes as small local units of administration should be permitted, is derived from the diminished and diminishing capacity of Parliament to control the permanent staff of departments of Government. *The control of Parliament is really the sole means by which a check can be kept upon the many abuses of*

*centralization*, for ventilation through the press leads to so much organized trickery of attack and defence, and is so void of opportunity for sober correction, that it sometimes does more to foster than to repress abuses. Parliament, however, is now much overloaded through the great increase of its Imperial business, and from many lively desires to utilize its legislative powers upon a far greater range of employment than formerly. Its ancient and valuable function of redressing grievances is, therefore, in danger of being crowded out. On this ground the position is very serious, because no other means, except that of the Parliamentary check, can be imagined which would be powerful enough to deal with abuses from oppression and obstruction in a department of the Central Government.

*It seems evident, therefore, that if parishes are allowed to acquire powers of self-management, the work of regulation and control over them must be placed in the hands of County Councils,* as the control of so many small authorities by a Government Department would otherwise give rise to a great increase of centralization, and to a proportionate increase in the evils which arise from it. The decentralizing interposition of County Councils is also required in the interests of the parishes. A central Government Department would have no power to help them ; it is too remote, too difficult of approach, and too cumbrous in working its business. On the other hand, County Councils are locally accessible, and work as open Courts. A popular representative assembly is not hide-bound and negative like official departmentalism. Moreover, it would be natural for the parishes to place themselves under the guardianship and control of their own County Council.

An important part of the control of the Local Government Board is carried out by means of Local Government Enquiries. A Local Government Enquiry is now necessary for the settlement of a great variety of questions, and of disputes between local authorities, and between local authorities and private individuals upon rights and obligations of various kinds of public or local importance. In a Local Government Enquiry before one of the Local Government Board Inspectors, the parties opposed present

Local Government Enquiry at present a dis-satisfying proceeding and full of needless secrecy.

their case by themselves or counsel, the Inspector takes down the evidence, and at the close of the enquiry, which may last many days, merely says that he will report to the Local Government Board. After an interval both parties receive from the Local Government Board a letter stating the decision, and it is not usual to state any of the considerations which have had influence in arriving at the decision, or to allow the parties to see the notes of evidence taken down by the Inspector.

Contrast presented between hearing before Court of Law and hearing by Local Government Enquiry.

In fact, the practice in a Local Government Enquiry is far more high handed than that of a Court of Law. In the latter the *judge in person* hears the case, sees and can question the witnesses, has every opportunity of informing his mind and feels the stimulus which the performance of public duty in open Court must provide, whereas the person giving judgment after a Local Government Enquiry *sees and hears nothing for himself*—but is dependent upon the Inspector who conducted the enquiry, and the report that official makes upon it, which is secret. *In a Court of Law the judge gives the reasons which have guided him to a decision, and his decision may be appealed against and the case reheard. The decision upon a Local Government Enquiry on the other hand is unaccompanied by reasons and there is no appeal from it.* The statement which accompanies the judgment of a Court carries with it the evidence of a deliberate weighing of the matter, which does much to satisfy the mind and feelings. From the nature of the cases heard by Local Government Enquiry such a practice would be particularly expedient, but on the contrary, the process of Local Government Enquiry is arbitrary, tortuous, full of concealment, and consequently disatisfying.

The system pursued in Local Government Enquiries as now conducted in the locality where the questions or disputes arise, presents three serious openings for a miscarriage of justice—

(1.) From the case *not being heard by* the person or persons who will give judgment upon it;

(2.) From *inability on the part of the inspector* to present the merits of the case *by a report* upon it, which it is an extremely difficult thing to do ;

(3.) From *inability on the part of the Department Official or Minister*—no opportunity having been offered him for a personal judgment,—to grasp the case fairly and fully upon any presentation of it in a report from a third person—however excellent that report may be.

If these appeals and local enquiries were heard and conducted by a County Council, utilising, when necessary, in the way proposed by the Parish Government Bill, the services of the staff of Inspectors in the employ of the Local Government Board or the Board of Trade, the matter to be enquired into would be referred to a Committee of the County Council, and by such a Committee the evidence would be taken and investigated in much the same way as matters affecting the country generally are dealt with by a Parliamentary Committee. The Committee of the County Council not only would take into account the opinion of the Inspectors, but would communicate with the parties concerned, and take such further action as the merits of the case might demand. The decision would thus issue from a court in touch with the neighbourhood, having full local knowledge and specially constituted for dealing in an open and responsible manner with the matters of local management affecting the county. The County Council would be the natural authority for decision in local matters affecting its County, subject possibly to a Parliamentary or departmental sanction where other than local considerations were involved. The Reports also of local enquiries would be possessed by the county concerned, and, being accessible for local reference, could be made serviceable in many ways.

The difficulties connected with local administration below the county management would disappear if all matters of local management were, as regards supervision and remedial control, transferred from the Local Government Board to County Councils as courts of assistance to

County Councils  
could furnish  
capable and open  
Court for Local  
Enquiries.

County Councils  
should not only  
decentralize  
Control over  
parishes but also  
assist towards  
necessary

national control  
over general  
local adminis-  
tration.

their rural parishes. In this way County Councils, rightly developed and employed, might be utilized as agencies for affording general and important assistance to the Central Authority in all the purposes of a necessary national control over local administration throughout the country. County Councils would thus decentralize by protecting local government within their area from the oppressive interference of a remote Central Authority, but at the same time they could give important assistance towards a national control over local administration generally, because they would occupy the best possible position for gathering information and results from their parishes. By this means the Central Department, being released from the burden of the petty routine details of small local authorities within the county, would find itself better able to draw to a focus its control over all local administration through the knowledge furnished to it from the county centres. In short, the force of unity in administration, in policy, and in direction could be far better secured by limiting the obligations of the Local Government Board in regard to sanction and control to the County Councils, and taking away its present power of direct interference with local authorities under the county. It will be found that powers are provided by the Parish Government Bill for carrying these views into effect.

---

PART IV.

---

A

SYSTEM OF COMPLETE LOCAL SELF-MANAGEMENT  
ESTABLISHING  
ONE RATING AUTHORITY  
AND  
ONE AREA ONLY UNDER THE COUNTY.

---

*Division I.—A General View of the Parish Government Bill.*

---

THIS scheme of self-management by the Parish Unit resembles our Parliamentary frame of Government. It confers upon the Parish Committee a Treasury power of drawing financial control of all parish expenditure to one focus, and it also rejects an irremovable-for-fixed-period Executive.

The Bill does not contemplate any Authority for local management in rural parishes intermediate between the Parish and its County Council.

The Bill provides for A PARISH BUDGET as a system of forecast, to enable Ratepayers to HOLD THEIR EXPENDITURE BY THE BRIDLE INSTEAD OF, AS THEY NOW DO, BY THE TAIL. THE PARISH COMMITTEE, acting in all matters of money and account, is required to present to the inhabitants at their Easter and Michaelmas Vestries the General Accounts of the Parish for the past half-year, together with a BUDGET OF WAYS AND MEANS presenting the liabilities and estimated expenditure for the ensuing half-year for Poor Relief, Sanitary objects, Education, Highway and other parish purposes and obligations.

The Bill provides for THE PARISH COMMITTEE as the General Executive, and for such SEPARATE COMMITTEES as may be desired by the inhabitants for the administration of Poor Relief, Sanitary matters, Education, Highway and other parish purposes; but the Parish Committee is to act for the parish in all matters for which such separate Committees are not appointed. The Parish Committee is appointed for one year, subject to a power for discharge and appointment of successors. The terms of appointment of the other Committees would be settled by the inhabitants. There is no machinery to force upon the Ratepayers, whether under the cover of an election or in other manner, a surrender of their control for a fixed period, but on the contrary the Ratepayers can exert a practically continuous control in their parish affairs.

By the Bill THE UNION as it affects rural parishes would become substantially an Association of the parishes to provide co-operatively for indoor poor relief, the Overseers being Guardians for this purpose.

By the Bill, PUBLIC ELEMENTARY EDUCATION as an obligation would rest upon the inhabitants so far as compulsory school attendance is concerned, and the other obligations and powers of the Education Acts would be dealt with by arrangements between the Education Department and the inhabitants, under the powers of those Acts.

By the Bill, ALLOTMENTS would be provided, and administered by the inhabitants under the powers and duties of the Act of 1887, and the appeal powers given to the County Councils by the Act of 1890.

The Bill establishes powers in COUNTY COUNCILS for the exercise of remedial control over rural parishes by supervision, by action upon appeal and in other ways, particularly through the transference of appeals and of Local Enquiries from the Local Government Board to the County Councils.

Under the Bill a County Council would have power to—

- (1.) Approve and allow the Parish Rate.

- (2.) Sanction the exercise of borrowing powers by Parishes.
- (3.) Hear and determine appeals under the Public Health Acts.
- (4.) Approve the appointment of Overseer.
- (5.) Audit the Parish Accounts by its Auditor.
- (6.) Supervise Public Health matters.
- (7.) Have control over Highways.
- (8.) Sanction the joint appointment of Officers by two or more Parishes.

By the Bill, rural parishes have power to appeal to the Local Government Board with respect to the action or default of County Councils in the exercise of the powers transferred to them.

By the Bill, the Local Government Board upon appeal, or otherwise, may compel the due performance by County Councils of the duties transferred to them.

By the Bill, power is reserved to the Local Government Board, when circumstances in their opinion render it necessary, to make general orders under the Public Health Acts as heretofore.

**NOTE.**—Probably some of the numerous objections and questions which present themselves in so large a matter as that of Parish Administration may be answered illustratively by reference to the extracts taken from Parish Vestry Minutes set out in the Appendix.

---

---

---

*Division II.—Summary of Provisions under the Parish Government Bill.*

---

- (A.) The parish becomes a body corporate with Sections 1, 2, perpetual succession and a common seal, and power to hold land. Incorporation  
Parish

Sections 4, 5, 6, 7.  
Meetings of  
Ratepayers, and  
Voting.

(B.) Meetings of the parish are to be held at Easter and Michaelmas, and meetings may be called whenever necessary by the Chairman of Vestry or by one of the Overseers, or by ten inhabitants of the parish. Every inhabitant shall have one vote and no more. Minutes of proceedings are to be taken and kept.

Sections 8, 9.  
Of Chairman  
of Vestry  
and Overseers.

(C.) At the Easter Vestry, the Chairman of Vestry is to be elected and the Overseers are to be nominated. Justices' power to appoint persons to be overseers of the poor is to be transferred to County Council.

Section 10.  
The Parish  
Committee  
paymaster and  
tax collector.  
Sections 26,  
27, 28

(D.) At the Easter Vestry the Parish Committee is to be appointed for one year, the ratepayers having power at any time to remove such Parish Committee and to appoint successors. Chairman of Vestry and Overseers are to be members by virtue of their offices. The Parish Committee becomes sole Paymaster and Tax Collector for Parish purposes.

Sections 11,  
12, 13, 14.  
Parish Officers.

(E.) Appointment of Parish Treasurer, Clerk, and other officers. Two or more parishes may agree to appoint one person jointly.

Section 15.  
Committees  
for special  
purposes.

(F.) The parish may appoint committees to exercise powers or perform parish duties. Any two or more parishes may agree to appoint a joint committee for any purpose in which they have a joint interest.

Section 16.  
Administration  
of Poor Laws.

The Parish Rate is to be made in open Vestry by the Parish Committee.

(G.) The overseers of rural parishes in a union are to become its guardians. The overseers and a poor relief committee appointed by the parish are to have powers and duties of out-door relief. In default of appointment of a poor relief committee, the Parish Committee is to act.

Section 17.  
Execution of  
Public Health  
Acts and Burial  
Acts.

(H.) The inhabitants are to perform the duties of existing Rural Sanitary Authorities, and the property, debts, and liabilities of Rural Sanitary Authorities are to be apportioned among the parishes composing such authorities. If a Sanitary Committee be not appointed, the Parish Committee is to act. The County Council are to appoint Medical Officer of Health, who shall make a quarterly report, and such other reports as he may consider neces-

sary, to the inhabitants and to the County Council upon the sanitary condition of the parish, and upon the condition and sufficiency of graveyard or cemetery. Powers under the Burial Acts are transferred to inhabitants.

(I.) The County Council are to exercise and perform Section 18. the powers and duties now carried out by Local Government Board in regard to appeals and local enquiries.

(J.) The inhabitants, if aggrieved by the exercise of Section 19.  
Appeal to Local  
Government  
Board against  
action or default  
of County  
Council. any power or the performance of any duty transferred from the Local Government Board to the County Council, may appeal to the Local Government Board, and the Local Government Board is empowered to make such order as they think just. Where any County Council shall have made default in the exercise of any power or the performance of any duty transferred to them, the Local Government Board is empowered to make an order requiring performance. Power is also reserved to the Local Government Board to make general orders under the Public Health Acts as heretofore.

(K.) The inhabitants are to exercise the powers and Section 20.  
Administration  
of Education  
Acts. duties of existing School Board or Rural Sanitary Authority in rural parishes under the Elementary Education Act. The parish is to appoint an Education Committee, or join with one or more parishes in appointing a joint committee. In default of appointment of Education Committee, the Parish Committee is to act.

(L.) The parish is to have the powers, rights and Section 21.  
Administration  
relating to  
Highways. liabilities of Surveyor of Highways or Highway Board in rural parishes, and is to appoint a Highways Committee, or join with one or more parishes in appointing a joint Highways Committee. In default of appointment of Highways Committee, the Parish Committee is to act.

(M.) Charity Funds vested in the minister, churchwardens, and overseers, or any of them, are to vest in the Section 22.  
Charitable  
Trusts Com-  
mittee. parish, which may appoint a Charitable Trusts Committee. In default of appointment of Charitable Trusts Committee, the Parish Committee is to act.

(N.) Allotments are to vest in the parish, which Section 23.  
Allotments  
Committee. may appoint an Allotments Committee. In default of Committee.

appointment of such Allotments Committee, the Parish Committee is to act.

**Section 24.**  
Administration  
of various Acts.

(O.) The powers, property and liabilities of authorities acting within rural parishes for the execution of—

- (a) The Lighting and Watching Acts;
- (b) The Baths and Washhouses Acts ;
- (c) The Artisans and Labourers' Dwellings Acts ;
- (d) The Public Libraries Acts ;
- (e) The Burial Acts ;
- (f) The Public Improvement Act, 1890 ;
- (g) The Private Streets Works Act, 1892 ;

are to be transferred to the inhabitants of rural parishes.

**Sections 25,  
26, 27, 28, 29.  
Payments,  
Accounts,  
and Audit.**

(P.) As soon as practicable after the thirty-first day of March and thirtieth day of September, the Parish Committee is to lay the balance-sheet of accounts and liabilities and the estimate of expenditure for the ensuing half-year before the inhabitants in vestry, who may require the overseers to make a rate to meet such expenditure. The overseers are to make one rate, to be called the Parish Rate, in the nature of a poor rate, to defray charges required by law to be paid out of the poor rate, and for general parish expenses. The rate, signed by the overseers, is to be sealed by the Chairman of Vestry with the seal of the parish, and laid before the County Council for allowance, and is deemed to be made on the date when such allowance is made. All expenses are to be paid by the treasurer on the order of the Parish Committee, countersigned by the vestry clerk. The accounts are to be audited by auditors appointed by County Council.

**Section 30.**

(Q.) Any notice, writ, summons or legal process may be served upon the ratepayers by leaving the same with the vestry clerk, the Chairman of the Vestry or an overseer.

*Division III.—Draft of the Parish Government Bill.*

---

ARRANGEMENT OF CLAUSES.

Clause.

1. Title of Bill.
2. Interpretation of terms.
3. Incorporation of parish.
4. Meetings of inhabitants in vestry.
5. Meetings, how to be called.
6. Voting at meetings.
7. Minutes.
8. Election of chairman.
9. Election of overseers.
10. Election of parish committee.
11. Clerk and treasurer.
12. Appointment of officers of parish.
13. Officers for joint parishes.
14. Officers intrusted with money to give security.
15. Power to appoint committees.
16. Administration of the poor laws.
17. Execution of the Public Health Acts by parish.
18. County Council to exercise powers of Local Government Board under the Public Health Acts.
19. Appeal by parishes to Local Government Board against action of County Council.
20. Parish to exercise powers and duties of School Board.
21. Administration of the laws relating to highways.
22. Administration of parish charitable trusts to be vested in parish.
23. Administration of allotments to be vested in parish.

## Clause.

24. Administration of various Acts to be transferred to parish.
  25. Accounts.
  26. Half-yearly estimates of expenditure.
  27. Rates.
  28. Payment of expenses.
  29. Audit of accounts.
  30. Notice, writ, or legal process upon the inhabitants to be served upon the vestry clerk, chairman or overseer.
  31. Appointed day.
  32. Act not to extend to Scotland or Ireland.
-

A

# BILL

TO

*Incorporate the inhabitants of rural parishes in vestry, and to transfer to them the power and duties of various authorities.*

WHEREAS it is expedient that the rights, duties, and powers of the different local authorities now charged with the administration—

- of Poor Relief;
- of Elementary Education;
- of the Sanitary Acts;
- of the Highway Acts;
- of the Burial Acts;

and with various other duties and obligations within the same area should be transferred to one local authority constituted to act within one area, and to have sole power to cause rates to be levied, and to borrow money for all local purposes belonging to that area :

And whereas it is expedient that the existing parishes should be maintained, but with power to the inhabitants to agree with the inhabitants of other parishes for joint action for their common benefit :

And whereas it is expedient that the inhabitants should acquire and exercise rights, duties, and powers of self-management in their own local affairs :

Be it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows :

1. This Act shall be called the Parish Government Act, Short title.  
1893.

Interpretation  
of terms.

**2.** For the purposes of this Act the expression "parish" shall mean a place for which a separate overseer now is or can be appointed, and which is not included in a borough or urban district; and where part of any parish is within and part without a borough or urban district shall mean the part which is without such borough or urban district.

The expression "inhabitants" shall mean the inhabitants in vestry.

The expression "inhabitant" shall mean any person entitled to vote at any meeting of the inhabitants in vestry.

Incorporation  
of parish.

**3.** After the passing of this Act the inhabitants of a parish shall be a body corporate and shall have perpetual succession and a common seal, and power to acquire and hold land for the purposes of their constitution without license in mortmain.

Meetings of  
inhabitants in  
vestry.

**4.** A meeting of the inhabitants, to be called the Easter Vestry, shall be held in every parish on the thirty-first day of March in each year or within six days thereafter, and a meeting of the inhabitants, to be called the Michaelmas Vestry, shall be held in every parish on the thirteenth day of October or within six days thereafter, and meetings shall be held at such other times as may be found necessary.

Meetings, how  
to be called.

**5.—(1.)** A meeting of the inhabitants shall be called by a notice signed by the chairman or by one of the overseers. Such notice, or a copy thereof, shall be affixed on or near the door of every church and chapel within the parish, and shall be kept so affixed for three days previous to the meeting, of which days one shall be Sunday. Such notice shall state in general terms the business to be transacted at such meeting.

**(2.)** The chairman or an overseer may call a meeting at any time, and the chairman or an overseer shall call a meeting upon being so required in writing by any ten inhabitants of the parish entitled to vote at a meeting.

Voting at  
Meetings.

**6.—(1.)** Every person shall be deemed to be an inhabitant and shall be entitled to vote at a meeting if his name appears in the occupiers' column of the last poor

rate made for the parish : Provided always, that an inhabitant shall be entitled to vote though his name does not so appear if notwithstanding the omission of his name from the rate he would be entitled to any qualification or franchise depending upon rating as provided by thirty-two and thirty-three Victoria, chapter forty-one, section nineteen.

(2). Every inhabitant shall be entitled to give one <sup>32 & 33 Vict.</sup>  
<sup>c. 41.</sup> vote and no more. Any question arising at a meeting shall be determined by the majority of the inhabitants present and voting on such question.

(3.) In the event of an equality of votes the chairman shall have a second or casting vote.

(4.) Any inhabitant present at a meeting may demand <sup>Poll of parish.</sup> that a poll of the inhabitants shall be taken on any question, and thereupon it shall be the duty of the chairman to take such poll at such time or times and at such place or places within the parish as shall in his opinion afford reasonable facilities for every inhabitant to record his vote. The expenses of taking such poll shall be paid to the chairman by the treasurer out of the funds in his hands applicable to the general expenses of the parish as hereinafter mentioned.

7.—Minutes of the proceedings at any meeting shall <sup>Minutes.</sup> be taken and kept, and a copy or extract therefrom authenticated by the signature of the clerk shall be evidence in all legal proceedings.

8.—(1.) At the meeting held on the thirty-first day of March, or within six days thereafter (herein-after called the Easter vestry), the inhabitants shall elect a fit person from among the inhabitants to be chairman of vestry for the ensuing year and until his successor is appointed. From and after the appointed day the right of any rector, vicar, curate, or other person to be chairman of the vestry shall cease and determine.

(2). The chairman shall preside at all meetings. In his absence a chairman shall be appointed by the inhabitants present at any meeting to preside at such meeting.

9. At the Easter Vestry the inhabitants shall nominate <sup>Election of overseers.</sup> not less than four fit and proper persons, of whom the

county council shall appoint two, to be overseers of the poor, who shall hold office for the ensuing year and until their successors are appointed. From and after the appointed day the right of justices to appoint persons to be overseers of the poor shall cease and determine. A churchwarden shall cease to be an overseer by virtue of his office of churchwarden.

**10.—(1.)** At the Easter meeting the inhabitants shall appoint a parish committee, who shall hold office for one year, unless successors to them be appointed within that period, and it shall be lawful for the inhabitants, at a meeting to be called for the purpose, at any time, to supersede the committee for the time being and appoint successors to them.

(2.) In addition to the members elected from time to time by the inhabitants, the chairman of the vestry and the overseers shall ex-officio be members of such committee.

(3.) Such parish committee shall consist of inhabitants of the parish, in number not less than seven nor more than twenty, exclusive of the chairman and overseers.

(4.) The inhabitants may at any time, at a meeting called for the purpose, elect members of the parish committee in place of any who may have died, resigned, or become disqualified or incapable of acting.

**11.** The inhabitants shall from time to time appoint fit and proper persons to be their clerk and treasurer. The clerk shall take the minutes, and perform any other duties to be performed by the clerk under this Act, and such further or other duties as the inhabitants shall from time to time prescribe. The clerk and treasurer shall hold office at the pleasure of the inhabitants, and shall receive such remuneration as the inhabitants shall from time to time fix.

Clerk and  
treasurer.

Appointment of  
officers of parish.

**12.—(1.)** The inhabitants may from time to time appoint an assistant overseer or collector, and such other inspectors or officers as they may deem necessary for the execution of the powers and duties conferred upon them by this Act. Such officers shall hold office at the pleasure

of the inhabitants, and shall perform such duties and receive such remuneration as the inhabitants shall from time to time prescribe. No confirmation or appointment by justices shall be required for the appointment of any such officer.

**13.** (1.) The inhabitants of two or more parishes may, <sup>Officers for joint parishes.</sup> with the consent of the county council, appoint one person as an officer for both or all of such parishes, and upon such terms and conditions as to remuneration and the proportion to be contributed by each parish as may be agreed upon.

(2.) An officer may be an inhabitant of the parish, but while he holds his office he shall not vote at any meeting of the inhabitants.

(3.) An officer shall not directly or indirectly be concerned or interested in any contracts entered into by or on behalf of the inhabitants. If any officer is so concerned or interested he shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding twenty pounds and shall become disqualified to hold any office in the same parish. <sup>Officers not to contract with parish.</sup>

**14.** Every paid officer who may be entrusted with the custody or control of money shall give to the inhabitants sufficient security for the faithful execution of his duties, and for duly accounting for all moneys which may be entrusted to him by reason thereof. <sup>Officers entrusted with money to give security.</sup>

**15.—(1.)** Any power or duty conferred or imposed upon the inhabitants by this Act may be exercised or performed by the parish committee or by a committee appointed at any meeting. <sup>Power to appoint committees.</sup>

(2.) Such committee shall consist of not less than three, who shall be persons entitled to vote at a meeting.

(3.) A committee shall appoint a chairman who shall have a second or casting vote.

— (4.) The quorum of a committee shall be three.

(5.) Any two or more parishes may agree to appoint a joint committee for any purpose in which they have a joint interest, and the provisions of this Act as to committees shall apply to any such joint committees. <sup>Joint committees for two or more parishes.</sup>

Administration  
of the poor laws.

Overseers and  
guardians of  
parish to form  
board of  
guardians.

Overseers and  
poor relief com-  
mittee to  
administer out-  
door relief.

Execution of the  
Public Health  
Acts by parish.

County Council  
to exercise  
powers of Local  
Government  
Board as to out-  
door relief.

**16.—(1.)** From and after the appointed day the existing boards of guardians of a union shall cease to exist, and the overseers of the parishes in a union together with the guardians elected as heretofore for any parish, wholly or partly within an urban district shall form the board of guardians of such union, and shall have and be subject to all powers, duties, and liabilities of the guardians of such union under any statute or order or otherwise, and shall be deemed to be the successors in law of the existing boards of guardians, and all property, debts, and liabilities of the existing board of guardians shall vest in them: Provided, however, that in any parish which now has a separate board of guardians the inhabitants of such parish in vestry shall have and be subject to all such powers, duties, and liabilities as are in union transferred by this section to the overseers.

(2.) From and after the appointed day the overseers and a poor relief committee which may be appointed for that purpose by the inhabitants shall exercise and perform within their parish all powers and duties in connexion with the administration of outdoor relief.

(3.) If and while the inhabitants shall not have appointed a poor relief committee, the parish committee shall be charged with and shall execute and perform all the powers and duties connected with the administration of outdoor relief.

**17.—(1.)** From and after the appointed day the inhabitants shall, to the exclusion of every other authority, have and be subject to all the powers, duties, and liabilities under any Act of a rural sanitary authority within their parish and all powers and duties of the Local Government Board under any existing Acts or Orders relating to the administration of out-door relief, including the power to make any order relating to the administration of out-door relief, shall in any parish to which this Act applies be exercised by the county council of the county in which such parish or the greater part thereof is situate.

(2.) All property, debts, and liabilities of the guardians of the union as rural sanitary authority shall, from and

after the appointed day, be transferred to the inhabitants of the parishes composing such rural sanitary authority, and shall, if necessary, be apportioned among the parishes for which such property may be jointly held or which may be jointly liable for such debts and liabilities. Such apportionment shall be made by the guardians before the appointed day; but if the inhabitants of any parish shall deem themselves aggrieved by such apportionment they may require a re-apportionment by an arbitrator to be appointed by the county council.

(3.) Where any works, whether of water supply, sewerage, or other have been provided for two or more parishes or parts of parishes, such works shall continue to be used for the joint benefit of such parts, and shall be managed and carried on by a joint committee appointed by the inhabitants of the parishes for the whole or any part of which they shall have been provided; and the expenses of such management shall be defrayed out of the rates of such parishes made pursuant to the Public Health Act, 1875, or in the case of a part of a parish, out of a separate rate made and levied by the overseers on such part as if it were a separate parish.

(4.) The inhabitants in vestry shall not appoint a medical officer of health, but such officer shall be appointed by the county council, and shall exercise and be subject to all the powers and duties of such officers under the Public Health Act, 1875, and any Act amending the same in such parish or parishes as the county council shall appoint.

(5.) It shall be the duty of the medical officer to make quarterly reports, and such special reports as he may think necessary, upon the sanitary condition of the parish or parishes for which he acts. Such reports shall be in addition to any reports which he is now required by any Act or order to make, and shall be made to the inhabitants of each parish and to the county council. He shall also report to the county council whether the inhabitants of any parish have in any respect failed to carry out the provisions of the Public Health Act, 1875, or the Acts amending the same, and upon such report the county council shall have all the powers of the Local Government Board.

Works provided  
or two or more  
parishes to be  
carried on by  
joint committee.

38 & 39 Vict.  
c. 55.

Appointment of  
medical officer  
of health by  
County Council.

Reports by  
medical officer  
to parish and  
county council.

38 & 39 Vict.  
c. 55.

under section two hundred and ninety-nine of the Public Health Act, 1875, as if such report were a complaint within the meaning of that section.

(7.) It shall be the duty of the medical officer from time to time, as occasion may require, to report to the inhabitants and to the county council upon the sufficiency and condition of the churchyard burial ground or cemetery available for the interment of the dead in such parish. In the event of his reporting that the existing accommodation for burials is insufficient the inhabitants shall forthwith provide a sufficient burial ground or cemetery, and in default of their so doing the county council shall have the same power of compelling them so to do as if the report of the medical officer were a complaint within the meaning of section two hundred and ninety-nine of the Public Health Act, 1875, and the county council were the Local Government Board.

38 & 39 Vict.  
c. 55.

Parish committee to fulfil duties imposed by this section until appointment of sanitary committee or joint committee.

(8.) If and while the inhabitants shall not have appointed a sanitary committee or with some other parish or parishes appointed a joint committee to execute and fulfil the powers and duties conferred or imposed upon them by this section, the parish committee shall be charged with the execution and fulfilment of such powers and duties, and shall exercise and perform the same within the parish.

County Council to exercise powers of Local Government Board under the Public Health Acts.

**18.** From and after the appointed day, all powers and duties exercised by or imposed upon the Local Government Board under the Public Health Acts, or under any Act relating to a rural sanitary authority or a rural parish, shall be exercised and performed, with reference to any parish to which this Act applies, by the county council of the county within which such parish or the greater part thereof is situate: Provided, nevertheless, that an appeal under Sections 268, 299 of the Public Health Act, 1875, or under any other Act or section whereby an appeal now lies to the Local Government Board shall be heard and determined only by a judicial committee of the county council, such committee to consist of not less than seven members of the council, to be appointed annually at the April quarterly meeting of the council: Provided also

County Council to appoint judicial committee to hear appeal

that when a county council are required or determine to hold a local enquiry under any such Acts as aforesaid, they shall hold such enquiry by a committee of not less than three members of their body, and such committee shall be at liberty to apply to the Local Government Board, and the Local Government Board shall on such application appoint one of their inspectors to attend such enquiry, and advise or otherwise assist such committee in and about the holding of such enquiry and the reporting of the result of such enquiry to the county council.

County Council  
to hold local  
enquiries.

**19.** (1.)—Where the inhabitants of any parish shall deem themselves aggrieved by the exercise of any power or the performance of any duty transferred from the Local Government Board to the county council by virtue of this Act, it shall be lawful for such inhabitants, within one month after such alleged grievance shall have arisen, to appeal to the Local Government Board, and the Local Government Board, if satisfied after due enquiry that such power has been exercised, or such duty performed improperly or unlawfully, or without due regard to the rights or interests of such inhabitants, or of other bodies or persons interested, may make such order as they think just with respect to the exercise of such power or the performance of such duty, and the county council shall give due effect to such order.

Appeal by  
parishes to Local  
Government  
Board against  
action of county  
council.

(2.) Where complaint is made by any ten or more inhabitants of a parish, or it is otherwise made to appear to the Local Government Board that the county council of the county in which such parish is situate has made default in the exercise of any power, or the performance of any duty transferred to them from the Local Government Board by this Act, the Local Government Board, if satisfied after due enquiry that the county council have been guilty of such default, shall make an order limiting a time for the performance of their duty in the matter of such complaint. If such duty is not performed by the time limited in the order, such order may be enforced by a writ of mandamus, or the Local Government Board may appoint some person to perform such duty, and shall by order direct that the expenses of performing the same, together with a reasonable remuneration to the person

Powers to Local  
Government  
Board to inter-  
fere in case of  
default of county  
council.

appointed for superintending such performance, and amounting to a sum specified in the order together with the costs of the proceedings, shall be paid by the county council, and any order for the payment of such expenses may be removed into the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, and enforced in the same manner as if it were an order of that Court. Any person appointed under this section to perform the duty of a county council shall have all the powers of the county council, and the Local Government Board may from time to time change any person so appointed.

**Reservation of powers to Local Government Board to make general orders under Public Health Acts as heretofore.**

(3.) Notwithstanding the transfer of powers and duties from the Local Government Board to the county council by virtue of this Act it shall be lawful for the Local Government Board to make general orders under the Public Health Acts, as if this Act had not passed, and such general orders when made shall supersede any orders made by the county council relating to the same subject matter in so far as they are inconsistent, and it shall be the duty of the county council to enforce and give effect to such general orders.

**Parish to exercise powers and duties of school board.**

**20.—(1.)** In any parish in which a school board shall have been constituted before the appointed day, the inhabitants shall after that day, to the exclusion of every other authority, exercise and be subject to all powers, duties and liabilities of such school board under the Elementary Education Act, 1870, and the Acts amending the same, and such inhabitants shall be deemed to be the successors in law of such a school board, and such school board shall cease to exist.

**Parish to exercise powers and duties of school attendance committee.**

**(2.)** In any parish in which a school board shall not have been constituted before the appointed day, the inhabitants shall after that day, to the exclusion of every other authority, exercise and be subject to all powers, duties and liabilities of a school attendance committee within the parish, and from and after that day the powers and duties of any existing school attendance committee shall cease and determine within such parish.

**Education department may invest parish**

**(3.)** In any parish to which the preceding sub-section applies, the Education Department shall have power to

invest the inhabitants with all the powers, duties and liabilities of a school board under the same circumstances as those under which they can now order a school board to be formed under the Elementary Education Act, 1870, or the Acts amending the same.

**21.—(1.)** The inhabitants shall within their parish have, exercise, and be subject to all powers, duties, rights, privileges, and liabilities of a highway surveyor, or highway board under the Highway Acts, 1835, 1862, 1864, 1878, and any Acts amending the same.

(2.) From and after the appointed day the powers, duties, and liabilities of the surveyor of highways in any parish shall cease and determine, and the property, debts, and liabilities of the surveyor shall become the property, debts and liabilities of the inhabitants.

(3.) From and after the appointed day the powers, duties and liabilities of every highway board, or of any board of guardians acting as a highway board, shall cease and determine, their property, debts, and liabilities shall be apportioned among and shall become the property, debts, and liabilities of the several parishes comprised in the highway district, in such shares and proportions as shall be determined by an arbitrator appointed for that purpose by the county council.

(4.) If and while the inhabitants shall not have appointed a highways committee or join with some other parish or parishes in the appointment of a joint committee to execute and perform the powers and duties transferred to them by this section, the parish committee shall be charged with the execution and performance of and shall execute and perform such powers and duties.

**22.—(1.)** From and after the appointed day the charity funds and property vested in the minister, churchwardens, and overseers, or any of them, for the benefit of the inhabitants shall be vested in and become the property of the inhabitants, who shall, to the exclusion of every other authority, control and administer such charity funds and property.

(2.) If and while the inhabitants shall not have appointed a charitable trusts committee the parish com-

with powers and  
duties of  
school board.

Administration  
of the laws  
relating to high-  
ways.  
5 & 6 Will 4,  
c. 50.

23 & 26 Vict.  
c. 61.

27 & 28 Vict.  
c. 101.

41 & 42 Vict.  
c. 77.

Powers of high-  
way surveyor or  
highway board  
to be exercised  
by parish.

Administration  
of parish charit-  
able trusts to be  
vested in parish.

mittee shall control and administer the parish charitable trusts and property.

Administration  
of allotments to  
be vested in  
parish.  
50 & 51 Vict.  
c. 48.

**23.—(1.)** From and after the appointed day the allotments vested in the rural sanitary authority or other body under the Allotments Act, 1887, or any other Act, shall be vested in and become the property of the inhabitants, and the inhabitants shall have power to provide allotments and to control the tenancy thereof, and shall have all the powers and be subject to all the duties and liabilities of a sanitary authority under the Allotments Act, 1887.

(2.). If and while the inhabitants shall not have appointed an allotments committee the parish committee shall control and administer the parish allotments.

Administration  
of various Acts  
to be transferred  
to parish.

3 & 4 Will. 4.

c 90.

9 & 10 Vict. c. 74

10 & 11 Vict. ,

c. 61.

41 Vict. c. 14.

45 & 46 Vict.

c. 30.

14 & 15 Vict.

c. 31.

29 Vict. c. 28.

30 & 31 Vict.

c. 28.

48 & 49 Vict.

c. 72.

53 & 54 Vict.

c. 70.

18 & 19 Vict.

c. 70.

29 & 30 Vict.

c. 114.

34 & 35 Vict.

c. 71.

**24.—(1.)** On the appointed day there shall be transferred to the inhabitants of every parish all powers, duties, property, and liabilities of any authority acting within the parish in the execution of:—

- (a.) The Lighting and Watching Acts ;
- (b.) The Baths and Washhouses Acts ;
- (c.) The Labouring Classes Lodging Houses Acts .
- (d.) The Public Libraries Acts ;
- (e.) The Burial Acts ;
- (f.) The Public Improvement Act, 1860 ;
- (g.) The Private Street Works Act, 1892 ;

and where the area within which such authority has jurisdiction is in more than one parish, the said powers, duties, property, and liabilities shall be transferred jointly to the inhabitants of the parishes in which any part of such area is situate.

(2.) The property, debts, and liabilities of any authority transferred to a parish by this section shall continue to be the property, debts, and liabilities of the area of the said authority, and the proceeds of the property shall be credited, and the debts and liabilities charged to the rates or contributions levied in such area.

(3.) The costs incurred in executing the powers, duties, and liabilities transferred by this section to the inhabitants of a parish shall continue

- (a) in so far as they are defrayed out of rates and contributions, to be defrayed out of rates or contributions raised within the same area, and subject to the same exemptions (if any) as the rates out of which these costs were defrayed before the passing of this Act; and
- (b) in so far as these costs would, if this Act had not passed, have been defrayed out of any revenue or other property to be defrayed out of the same revenue or property; and where the area of any such authority is situate in more than one parish, the sums accredited to and paid by each such parish shall be apportioned in such manner as to give effect to the foregoing enactment.

(4.) The county council on the application of the inhabitants of a parish may alter the boundaries of any such area, if they consider that such alteration can properly be made without any undue alteration of the incidence of liability to rates or contributions, or of advantage to the property belonging to such area, having regard to any corresponding advantage to the persons subject to the said liability or entitled to the said advantage.

(5.) After the appointed day any of the said Acts when adopted shall be executed only by the inhabitants of a parish in manner provided by this Act.

**25.—(1.)** The vestry clerk shall keep all necessary accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the inhabitants under this Act in the form prescribed by any orders made or to be made by the Local Government Board or anybody to whom the powers and duties of prescribing the form of accounts may by any future Act or order be transferred.

(2.) Such accounts shall be made out and balanced half-yearly to the thirty-first day of March and the thirtieth day of September, and shall be laid before the inhabitants at meetings to be held for that purpose as soon as practicable after these dates.

Half-yearly  
estimates of  
expenditure.

**26.** The parish committee shall at each of the meetings last above mentioned lay before the inhabitants an estimate of the expenditure for the ensuing half-year, and the inhabitants may thereafter require the overseers to make and levy such rates as may be necessary to meet such expenditure.

**Rates.** **27.—(1.)** The overseers shall make and levy one rate, to be called the parish rate, in the nature and with all the incidents of a poor rate to defray so much of such expenditure as may by law be paid out of the poor rate, or out of any rate which is by law made equally upon all rateable hereditaments in the parish, and the proceeds of such rate shall be applicable to the general expenses of the parish.

(2.) Where the expenses of executing the provisions of any Act, the execution whereof is hereby transferred to the inhabitants, are payable out of a separate rate made and levied on the several hereditaments in the parish in different proportions, the overseers shall make and levy a separate rate in the manner provided by the said Act, and such rate shall be applied in payment of the expenses of executing such Act, and not otherwise.

(3.) Where for the purposes of any Act, the execution whereof is hereby transferred to the inhabitants, it is necessary to levy a rate upon part only of a parish, such rate shall be levied separately in all respects as if such part were a parish, and shall be assessed and levied in all respects pursuant to the provisions of such Act.

(4.) All rates made and levied by the overseers shall be collected by them or by the assistant overseer and paid to the treasurer; and it shall be the duty of the treasurer to keep separate accounts of the rates levied for general expenses under this Act, and of the separate rates levied as hereinbefore mentioned under the second and third sub-sections of this section.

(5.) It shall not be necessary that a rate made for any purpose of this Act shall be allowed by justices, but every such rate shall be signed by the overseers in the usual way, and when so signed shall be sealed by the chairman of the vestry with the seal of the parish. On the day when a rate shall have been so sealed it shall be deemed

to have been made, unless within seven days thereafter a petition against such rate shall have been presented to the county council by not less than ten rated inhabitants of the parish, alleging that such rate has been made for purposes which are illegal or unnecessary. Upon such petition being presented, the county council shall, by a committee appointed for the purpose, hear and determine the matter of such petition, and the said rate shall be of no force or effect save in so far as it shall be allowed and approved by such committee. For the purpose of giving effect to their decision the committee shall have power to alter the rate in such manner as they shall think fit.

28. All expenses of the inhabitants incurred in the carrying out of the provisions of this Act, or of the Acts under which any powers, duties, or liabilities are transferred to them by this Act, shall be paid by the treasurer on the order of the parish committee. Such order shall be authenticated by being signed by not less than two members of the parish committee and countersigned by the vestry clerk or other person for the time being acting as the clerk of such committee.

29. The accounts of the inhabitants and of their officers shall be audited by auditors appointed by the county council, and such auditors shall be appointed as if in the enactments relating to district auditors such auditors were district auditors, and the county council were the Local Government Board. The said accounts shall be audited in like manner as accounts of an urban authority and their officers under sections two hundred and forty-seven and two hundred and fifty of the Public Health Act, 1875, and these sections and all enactments amending them or applying to audit by district auditors, including the enactments imposing penalties and providing for the recovery of sums and so far as they relate to the audit of the accounts of an urban authority and the officers of such authority as if they were herein re-enacted with the necessary modifications, and all inhabitants shall have the same rights as ratepayers under the said sections and enactments, and there shall be the same appeal as in the case of such audit.

Payment of expenses.

Audit of Accounts.

38 & 39 Vict.  
c. 55.

Notice, writ, or  
legal process  
upon the inhabi-  
tants to be  
served upon the  
vestry clerk,  
chairman or  
overseer.

Appointed day.

Act not to  
extend to  
Scotland or  
Ireland.

**30.** Any notice, writ, summons, or legal process may be given to or served upon the inhabitants by leaving the same with the vestry clerk at his parish offices, or if there are no parish offices, at his residence, or by leaving the same at the residence of the chairman or of an overseer.

**31.** For the purposes of this Act the appointed day shall be the first day of April next after the passing of this Act.

**32.** This Act shall not extend to Ireland or Scotland.

---

PART V.

---

---

*Appendix of Finchley Vestry Minutes, with Table showing Assessments, Rates, and Meetings from 1780 to 1841.*

---

THE following extracts are taken from the vestry minutes of a parish in order to exhibit practical evidence of the character of the parochial self-management which formerly prevailed. They present an interesting picture of plain practical details of work done by the inhabitants when meeting together for mutual counsel and the discussion of their affairs, with the rough and smooth of village life as set out by themselves in their contemporaneous records of it, showing how the inhabitants of a moderate-sized parish decided the various questions affecting them collectively by common consent among themselves, without interference from outside or strife within.

The vestry minutes are those of Finchley, a parish in the county of Middlesex, which in 1769 had an estimated population of 900. It contained 3,364 acres, of which about 1,200 was common. The rateable value in 1769 was about £4,366.

At the time these records were made the inhabitants had entire control over the whole of their local affairs. The minutes exhibit the complete establishment of the inhabitants as the sole authority for everything connected with the parish, the method of local management agreeing fully with the intention of the Statute 43rd Elizabeth, c. 2,

sec. 2, which prescribed that the churchwardens and overseers of every parish "shall meet together at least once every month in the church of the said parish upon the Sunday in the afternoon after divine service, there to consider of some good course to be taken and of some meet order to be set down in the premises."

In Finchley parish, up to the passing of the Poor Law Act of 1834, these injunctions were faithfully observed, and the inhabitants, with their churchwardens and overseers, met at least once a month to transact the business of their parish. The records previous to 1769 were unfortunately destroyed in a fire, but those since that date remain intact, and give forcible testimony to the capacity and careful regularity with which the parishioners transacted their local business before centralization had impaired local independence.

The vestry minutes cover, without any break, the whole period from 1769 down to the present time, and as the fairest manner of presenting an illustration of their general character, complete abstracts of the minutes of four years, separated by long and about equal intervals, have been taken. The year beginning Easter, 1769, being the first year of which the records remain, shows the parish work at a comparatively early period; the second year, at the end of the last century; the third, twenty-five years later, and a few years before the new Poor Law; and the last year selected is subsequent to the passing of that Act, but prior to the statutes removing from the parishes the management of their sanitary affairs.

Except in the case of the vestry clerk, the sexton, the constable, the head-borough, and for a time the common driver, all of whom received small salaries, the whole of the work of the parish up to 1840 was done by inhabitants giving gratuitous and voluntary service.

A significant power of adapting methods of management to local circumstances is shown by the fact that the inhabitants, for convenience of administration, had themselves divided the parish into two parts, north end and east end. They elected churchwardens, overseers, and

surveyors of highways for each division. The business, as appears by the minutes, comprised the entire management of—

- (a.) The poor ;
- (b.) Highways :
- (c.) Police :
- (d.) Sanitary matters.

The inhabitants acted also as the sole authority for everything connected with the parish, including full control over the fabric of the church and its churchyard, letting of pews, legal proceedings to assert their rights, and maintain their privileges, and (when appealed to by the Lord Lieutenant) the raising of money and of men in the parish for the defence of the realm.

It is evident that, notwithstanding the powers created by legislation during the period from which these minutes have been taken, enabling magistrates to supersede vestries in their management of the poor, the inhabitants of Finchley successfully maintained their independence in poor relief management down to 1835, and the table of the number of vestries held between 1780 and 1840, with the rates and assessments for the same period, indicates the point of time at which the decline in independent management commenced.

A reference to this table will show that the poor-rate for Finchley parish was less than half the average poor-rate for the whole county, and that up to the year 1836 the inhabitants met frequently in vestry. After the management of the poor was withdrawn, the number of vestries fell off largely, and the removal of the sanitary business to the Board of Guardians so undermined the influence and power of the inhabitants in their parish affairs, that after 1836 the vestries further decreased in number, and ultimately fell to two in the year. The minutes covering the period of true self-management, however, clearly show that the inhabitants did their duty both to the poor and to the ratepayers to the reasonable content of both, and in all departments of parochial administration appear to have been economical and efficient.

TABLE SHEWING RATES AND NUMBER OF VESTRY  
MEETINGS HELD FROM 1780 TO 1841.

| Year. | Date.    | Assessments. | Rate. |        | No. of Vestries. |
|-------|----------|--------------|-------|--------|------------------|
|       |          |              | £     | s. d.  |                  |
| 1780  | ..       | ..           | 2     | 3      | 21               |
| 1781  | ..       | ..           | 1     | 0      | 17               |
| 1782  | June 26  | . 4,366 0 0  | 1     | 3 { 2  | 19               |
| 1783  | Jan. 10  | ..           | 1     | 3 { 2  | 17               |
| "     | June 11  | ..           | 1     | 0 { 2  | 0                |
| 1784  | Jan. 7   | ..           | 1     | 0 { 2  | 0                |
| "     | Aug. 4   | ..           | 1     | 0 { 1  | 9                |
| 1785  | Jan. 5   | ..           | 0     | 9 { 1  | 9                |
| "     | June 15  | ..           | 0     | 9 { 1  | 9                |
| 1786  | Jan. 11  | ..           | 1     | 0 { 1  | 9                |
| "     | May 29   | ..           | 1     | 0 { 2  | 0                |
| 1787  | Jan. 10  | ..           | 1     | 0 { 2  | 0                |
| "     | June 7   | ..           | 1     | 0 { 2  | 6                |
| "     | Nov. 7   | ..           | 1     | 6 { 2  | 6                |
| 1788  | July 30  | ..           | 1     | 0 { 2  | 0                |
| 1789  | Feb. 4   | ..           | 1     | 0 { 2  | 0                |
| "     | Aug. 5   | ..           | 1     | 0 { 2  | 0                |
| 1790  | Feb. 10  | ..           | 1     | 0 { 2  | 0                |
| "     | Aug. 4   | ..           | 1     | 0 { 1  | 8                |
| 1791  | Feb. 9   | ..           | 0     | 8 { 1  | 8                |
| "     | Aug. 10  | . 4,800 0 0  | 1     | 0 { 1  | 10               |
| 1792  | Feb. 8   | ..           | 0     | 10 { 1 | 10               |
| "     | Aug. 15  | ..           | 1     | 0 { 1  | 8                |
| 1793  | March 4  | ..           | 0     | 8 { 1  | 8                |
| "     | Aug. 7   | ..           | 1     | 0 { 1  | 9                |
| 1794  | Jan. 8   | ..           | 0     | 9 { 1  | 9                |
| "     | July 9   | ..           | 1     | 0 { 1  | 9                |
| "     | Nov. 19  | ..           | 0     | 6 { 2  | 3                |
| 1795  | Feb. 11  | ..           | 0     | 9 { 1  | 8                |
| "     | June 10  | ..           | 1     | 0 { 2  | 3                |
| "     | Dec. 9   | ..           | 1     | 3 { 2  | 3                |
| 1796  | May 18   | ..           | 1     | 0 { 3  | 3                |
| "     | Oct. 5   | ..           | 1     | 3 { 3  | 3                |
| 1797  | Feb. 22  | ..           | 1     | 0 { 1  | 6                |
| "     | June 28  | ..           | 1     | 0 { 1  | 6                |
| "     | Nov. 29  | ..           | 1     | 0 { 2  | 6                |
| 1798  | March 28 | ..           | 0     | 6 { 2  | 0                |
| "     | July 18  | ..           | 1     | 0 { 2  | 0                |
| "     | Nov. 21  | ..           | 1     | 0 { 2  | 0                |

| Year. | Date.      | Assessments. | Rate.       | No. of Vestries |
|-------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|
|       |            | £ s. d.      | s. d. s. d. |                 |
| 1799  | June 5 .   | ..           | 0 9 } 2 9   | 15              |
| "     | Sept. 11 . | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| 1800  | Feb. 5 .   | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| "     | June 18 .  | ..           | 1 0 }       | 18              |
| "     | Nov. 5 .   | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| 1801  | Feb. 4 .   | 6,818 0 0    | 1 6 }       |                 |
| "     | June 17 .  | ..           | 1 0 }       | 20              |
| "     | Oct. 7 .   | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| 1802  | Feb. 10 .  | ..           | 0 9 }       | 18              |
| "     | June 9 .   | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| "     | Oct. 27 .  | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| 1803  | April 6 .  | ..           | 0 9 }       | 25              |
| "     | July 6 .   | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| "     | Aug. 7 .   | ..           | 0 8 }       |                 |
| "     | Dec. 8 .   | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| 1804  | June 17 .  | ..           | 0 6 }       | 21              |
| "     | Dec. 19 .  | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| 1805  | June 22 .  | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| "     | Dec. 4 .   | ..           | 1 0 }       | 24              |
| 1806  | April 2 .  | ..           | 0 4 }       | 17              |
| "     | April 8 .  | ..           | 0 4 }       |                 |
| "     | June 27 .  | ..           | 1 6 }       |                 |
| "     | Dec. 31 .  | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| 1807  | May 6 .    | ..           | 0 3 }       |                 |
| "     | July 22 .  | ..           | 1 0 }       | 22              |
| "     | Oct. 14 .  | ..           | 0 3 }       |                 |
| 1808  | Jan. 6 .   | ..           | 1 0 }       | 18              |
| "     | Aug. 3 .   | ..           | 1 6 }       |                 |
| "     | Dec. 14 .  | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| 1809  | May 23 .   | ..           | 1 6 }       | 16              |
| "     | Dec. 6 .   | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| 1810  | June 6 .   | ..           | 1 6 }       | 18              |
| "     | Dec. 5 .   | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| 1811  | June 12 .  | ..           | 1 6 }       | 19              |
| "     | Nov. 27 .  | ..           | 1 6 }       |                 |
| 1812  | June 10 .  | ..           | 1 0 }       | 26              |
| "     | Oct. 7 .   | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| "     | Dec. 9 .   | ..           | 1 6 }       |                 |
| 1813  | May 19 .   | ..           | 1 0 }       | 21              |
| "     | Oct. 6 .   | 11,891 5 0   | 1 6 }       |                 |
| "     | Oct. 6 .   | ..           | 1 0 }       |                 |
| 1814  | May 11 .   | ..           | 1 6 }       | 17              |
| "     | Nov. 9 .   | ..           | 1 6 }       |                 |
| 1815  | May 10 .   | ..           | 1 6 }       | 17              |
| "     | Nov. 5 .   | ..           | 1 6 }       |                 |

| Year. | Date.      | Assessments. | Rate.      | No. of Vestries. |
|-------|------------|--------------|------------|------------------|
|       |            | £ s. d.      | s. d.      |                  |
| 1816  | May 15 .   | ..           | 1 6        | 18               |
| "     | Oct. 2 .   | ..           | 1 6 } 4 0  |                  |
| 1817  | Feb. 26 .  | ..           | 1 0 }      | 20               |
| "     | June 19 .  | ..           | 1 6 } 2 9  |                  |
| "     | Dec. 10 .  | ..           | 1 3 }      |                  |
| 1818  | April 22 . | ..           | 1 6 } 3 0  | 18               |
| "     | Oct. 7 .   | ..           | 1 6 }      |                  |
| 1819  | April 13 . | ..           | 1 6 }      | 27               |
| "     | Oct. 12 .  | ..           | 0 9 } 3 0  |                  |
| 1820  | Jan. 25 .  | ..           | 0 9 }      | 23               |
| "     | April 25 . | ..           | 1 6 } 3 0  |                  |
| "     | Oct. 4 .   | ..           | 1 6 }      |                  |
| 1821  | April 24 . | ..           | 1 6 } 3 0  | 23               |
| "     | Oct. 18 .  | ..           | 1 6 }      |                  |
| 1822  | April 24 . | ..           | 1 6 } 3 0  | 22               |
| "     | Oct. 16 .  | ..           | 1 6 }      |                  |
| 1823  | April 16 . | ..           | 1 6 } 3 0  | 20               |
| "     | Oct. 9 .   | 9,257 5 0    | 1 6 }      |                  |
| 1824  | April 28 . | ..           | 1 6 } 3 6  | 25               |
| "     | Oct. 13 .  | ..           | 2 0 }      |                  |
| 1825  | May 5 .    | ..           | 1 6 } 3 0  | 25               |
| "     | Oct. 12 .  | ..           | 1 6 }      |                  |
| 1826  | May 3 .    | ..           | 1 6 } 3 0  | 23               |
| "     | Oct. 11 .  | ..           | 1 6 }      |                  |
| 1827  | May 2 .    | ..           | 1 6 } 3 0  | 22               |
| "     | Sept. 12 . | ..           | 1 6 }      |                  |
| 1828  | April 16 . | ..           | 2 0 } 3 6  | 24               |
| "     | Oct. 9 .   | ..           | 1 6 }      |                  |
| 1829  | April 30 . | ..           | 2 0 }      | 29               |
| "     | July 9 .   | ..           | 0 9 } 4 3  |                  |
| "     | Oct. 14 .  | ..           | 1 6 }      |                  |
| 1830  | April 21 . | ..           | 2 6 }      | 28               |
| "     | Oct. 13 .  | ..           | 1 9 }      |                  |
| 1831  | April 13 . | ..           | 2 6 }      | 19               |
| "     | Oct. 12 .  | ..           | 2 6 }      |                  |
| 1832  | April 12 . | ..           | 2 6 }      | 39               |
| "     | Oct. 11 .  | ..           | 1 9 }      |                  |
| 1833  | April 4 .  | 9,030 5 0    | 2 0 }      | 58               |
| "     | Oct. 3 .   | ..           | 3 0 }      |                  |
| 1834  | April 10 . | ..           | 2 0 }      | 56               |
| "     | Sept. 10 . | ..           | 3 0 }      |                  |
| 1835  | April 15 . | ..           | 2 3 }      | 63               |
| "     | Oct. 15 .  | ..           | 1 9 }      |                  |
| 1836  | April 21 . | ..           | 0 8 }      | 20               |
| "     | Sept. 15 . | ..           | 0 4 } 1 11 |                  |
| 1837  | Feb. 23 .  | ..           | 0 11 }     | 11               |

| Year. | Date.      | Assessments. | Rate.       | No. of Vestries. |
|-------|------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|
|       |            | £ s. d.      | s. d. s. d. |                  |
| 1837  | May 11 .   | ..           | 0 11 } 3 1  | 8                |
| "     | Dec. 1 .   | ..           | 0 8 }       |                  |
| 1838  | March 10 . | ..           | 1 6 }       | 11               |
| "     | Aug. 2 .   | ..           | 0 10 }      |                  |
| "     | Sept. 13 . | ..           | 0 4 }       | 18               |
| "     | Nov. 8 .   | ..           | 0 10 }      |                  |
| 1839  | Feb. 1 .   | ..           | 0 10 }      | 18               |
| "     | July 11 .  | ..           | 0 10 }      |                  |
| "     | Oct. 10 .  | ..           | 0 10 }      | 18               |
| 1840  | Jan. 4 .   | ..           | 0 2 }       |                  |
| "     | Feb. 13 .  | ..           | 1 8 }       | 18               |
| "     | April 10 . | ..           | 0 4 }       |                  |
| "     | May 6 .    | 12,109 8 0   | 1 0 }       | 18               |
| "     | Aug. 6 .   | ..           | 0 6 }       |                  |
| "     | Oct. 22 .  | ..           | 0 9 }       | 18               |
| 1841  | Jan. 7 .   | ..           | 0 6 }       |                  |

## VESTRY MINUTES OF FINCHLEY.

NOTES AS TO YEAR BEGINNING EASTER SUNDAY,  
1769.

In the year 1769 the population of this parish was probably about 900 souls, and the rateable value was £4,284.

The meetings of the inhabitants in Vestry were held in the Parish Church on Sundays after divine service.

The practice of "letting the poor" was in operation.

In this year the poor were let for £168.

The Contractor (William Hill) to keep and find the poor in clothing and diet, "such as is good wholesome and in every respect fitting for Christians."

The beds, linen and other goods delivered to Contractor to be kept and returned to the parish at the year's end according to a schedule.

The poor rate was 1s. 7d. for the whole year.

There were 18 meetings of the inhabitants in Vestry.

The persons present, or some of them, appear to have signed at end of minutes after the Chairman.

The inhabitants in Vestry arranged all parish affairs, made the poor rate, and allowed all payments out of poor rate, including payments on fabric of Parish Church and the churchyard.

At this time the inhabitants elected *both churchwardens*, but in later years the rector claimed and was allowed to exercise the right of nominating one.

The inhabitants elected two surveyors of highways who gave gratuitous service for the maintenance of the roads.

The Vestry appointed and paid the parish clerk, organist and sexton, and generally exercised rights of ownership over the church and churchyard.

1769-70.

MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

COPY VESTRY MINUTES FOR YEAR BEGINNING EASTER, 1769, AND  
ENDING EASTER, 1770.

At a vestry held the 28th day of March, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley for nominating overseers and choosing churchwardens for this present year, the following persons were chose and nominated:—

EAST END.

*Churchwardens:*

John Ecken.  
John Thomas.  
Thomas Wattnall.

*Overseers:*

Daniel Chevin.  
Richard Roberts.  
William Bonner.  
Vestry,

NORTH END.

*Churchwardens:*

John Croxford.  
William Smellcurn.  
John Jones.

*Overseers:*

Thomas Bishop.  
Thomas Furness.  
Thomas Lewiss.

(Signed by)

JOHN ECKEN, *Churchwarden.*

DANIEL CHEVIN, *Overseer of the Poor.*

JOHN BROWN.

THOMAS BISHOP.

ROBERT JONES.

1769-70.

At a vestry held the 2nd day of April, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*.—That the Overseers' Bills be allowed as under:—

|  |     |    |                  |
|--|-----|----|------------------|
| Baker's Bill .. .. .. .. ..                    | £1  | 9  | 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ |
| Butcher's do... .. .. .. ..                    | ..  | .. | ..               |
| Chandler's do. .. .. .. ..                     | ..  | 1  | 17               |
| Vestry, making rates .. .. .. ..               | ..  | 0  | 15               |
| Cloathing Claridge's girl .. .. .. ..          | ..  | 1  | 1                |
| Relieved Parker .. .. .. ..                    | ..  | 0  | 8                |
| Vestry, choosing officers .. .. .. ..          | ..  | 0  | 10               |
| Relieved Collyer .. .. .. ..                   | ..  | 0  | 4                |
| Tyler's girl .. .. .. ..                       | ..  | 0  | 2                |
| A man to Hornsey .. .. .. ..                   | ..  | 0  | 1                |
| Widow Audsley's rent to Lady Day, half-year .. | ..  | 0  | 12               |
| Nine bushels coals .. .. .. ..                 | ..  | 0  | 12               |
| Signing rates.. .. .. ..                       | ..  | 0  | 4                |
| Relieved Harwood .. .. .. ..                   | ..  | 0  | 6                |
| Vestry.. .. .. .. ..                           | ..  | 0  | 2                |
|  | £8  | 6  | 1 $\frac{1}{4}$  |
| Butcher's bill .. .. .. ..                     | ..  | 1  | 16               |
| Pensioners .. .. .. ..                         | ..  | 4  | 7                |
|  | £14 | 9  | 3 $\frac{1}{4}$  |

Widow Rofe allowed a pair of shoes.

Clark allowed a gown.

Skiteltharpe 6d. per day for nursing Shaw's wife.

Batten's girl to Mr. Clewin's discretion.

*In the Workhouse.*

|                          | <i>Pensioners.</i> |    |   |
|--------------------------|--------------------|----|---|
| Batten and two children. | Rushing ..         | £0 | 2 |
| Margaret Watson.         | Rofe ..            | 0  | 1 |
| Mary Cover and Child.    | Bonner ..          | 0  | 1 |
| Smith and Child.         | Grubb ..           | 0  | 1 |
| Mrs. Furnass.            | Staines ..         | 0  | 3 |
|                          | Holder ..          | 0  | 1 |
|                          | Mawl ..            | 0  | 2 |
|                          | Foxen ..           | 0  | 3 |
|                          | Wheeler ..         | 0  | 1 |
|                          | Blunden ..         | 0  | 1 |
|                          | Clark.. ..         | 0  | 1 |
|                          | Mores ..           | 0  | 2 |
|                          |                    | £1 | 1 |
|                          |                    | 9  |   |

*Ordered*.—That a vestry be called for letting the poor on Tuesday, the 11th inst., at 11 of the clock.

(Signed) JOHN ECKEN, Churchwarden.

and by DANL. CLEWIN, Overseer of the Poor.

Autographs of seven Ratepayers.

At a vestry held the 11th day of April, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex, for the letting of the poor.

*Ordered.*—And it is this day agreed by the churchwardens, overseers of the poor and other parishioners now assembled in vestry, that they have let all the poor the casualtys, rents, county levy, money, bills and all and everything relating to the parish and the said poor (the repairs of the church and what belongeth thereto excepted), to Mr. Willm. Hill, of the parish of Hornsey, at the sum of One hundred and sixty pounds for one whole year, commencing the first day of May next.

The money to be paid in equal proportions by the overseers of the poor at every monthly vestry.

#### ARTICLES TO BE COMPLY'D WITH.

1st. That the said Wm. Hill shall keep and find the poor in clothing and diet, such as is good, wholesome and in every respect fitting for Christians.

2nd. That the beds, bedding, linen and all other goods delivered to him at his entrance shall be kept and returned to the parish at the year's end according to the schedule taken and given to him at the time of his undertaking the said poor.

JOHN BROWN.

(Signed) JOHN ECKEN, *Churchwarden.*

DANL. CLEWIN, *Overseer of the Poor.*

I do hereby agree to the above arties.

WM. HILL.

Test.

R. JONES (*Vestry Clerk.*)

At a vestry held on the 7th day of May, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered.*—“That the Overseers' Bill be allowed as followeth :—

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Baker's Bill .. .. .. .. ..                            | £1 16 6  |
| Buteher's do. .. .. .. .. ..                           | 2 0 9½   |
| Chandler's do. .. .. .. .. ..                          | 2 9 3    |
| Paid for Audsley's wife .. .. .. .. ..                 | 3 12 10  |
| Collyer's Rent to Lady Day.. .. .. .. ..               | 1 10 0   |
| Paid for Hedging .. .. .. .. ..                        | 1 1 6    |
| Sanders Baker for More's Bread, 8 weeks .. .. .. .. .. | 1 0 0    |
| Widow Skiteltharpe Nursing Shaw .. .. .. .. ..         | 0 9 0    |
| Relieved Collier .. .. .. .. ..                        | 0 4 0    |
| Vestry Letting Poor .. .. .. .. ..                     | 0 10 0   |
| A Gown for Clark .. .. .. .. ..                        | 0 7 6    |
| Carried forward .. .. .. .. ..                         | £15 1 4½ |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Brought forward .. ..                                | £15 1 4½  |
| Tredget's maid .. ..                                 | 0 5 0     |
| Expenses at entrance on the Workhouse .. ..          | 0 5 6     |
| Humphrey's Shoemaker's Bill .. ..                    | 0 5 6     |
| Relieved Harwood .. ..                               | 0 6 0     |
| Eight Bushels of Coals .. ..                         | 0 10 8    |
| Pensioners .. ..                                     | 4 7 0     |
| Paid Mr. Hill maintaining Robt. Cook, 12 weeks..     | 1 16 0    |
| Doctor's Shift for do. ..                            | 0 4 0     |
| Collier for 8 weeks looking after Audsley's children | 0 12 0    |
| Vestry .. .. .. ..                                   | 0 2 6     |
|  | <hr/>     |
|  | £23 15 6½ |

(Signed) JOHN ECKEN, *Churchwarden.*

and by

DANL. CLEWIN }  
WM. HILL. } *Overseers of the Poor.*

And five Inhabitants.

At a vestry held the 30th day of August, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex, for passing the churchwardens and overseers' accounts, and for making a rate for the relief of the poor.

Mr. Ecken, Churchwarden—

|                                 |          |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| Received by the Rent Roll .. .. | £13 11 0 |
| Do. by Mortgage Money .. ..     | 0 14 0   |
|                                 | <hr/>    |
|                                 | £14 5 0  |

Disbursed as per following bills—

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Mr. Jones' Bill .. .. .. ..                     | £4 18 9 |
| Bell Ropes .. .. .. ..                          | 1 5 0   |
| Spiller for cleaning and mending clock .. ..    | 1 0 6   |
| Churchwardens' dinner .. .. .. ..               | 2 0 0   |
| Poor's Bread .. .. .. ..                        | 2 0 0   |
| Expenditure of the Commons, and Visitation, &c. | 2 0 0   |
|   | <hr/>   |
|   | £13 4 3 |

Mr. Clewin, Overseer—

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Received by 2 Rates of 1/3 in the Pound .. .. | £176 14 4½ |
| Disbursed .. .. .. ..                         | 190 17 2¾  |
|   | <hr/>      |
| Balance due to Mr. Clewin .. ..               | £14 2 10¼  |

Mr. Wardrobe, Overseer—

|  |   |    |    |    |
|--|---|----|----|----|
| Received by 2 Rates of 1/3 in the Pound .. | £ | 80 | 6  | 7  |
| Do. by Rent of Mr. Groves .. ..            |   | 4  | 14 | 6  |
|  |   |    |    | —  |
| Disbursed as per Monthly Bills £62 10 1½   | £ | 85 | 1  | 1  |
| Losses and Overcharged .. 4 16 6           |   |    |    | —  |
|  |   |    |    | —  |
| £67 6 7½                                   | £ | 67 | 6  | 7½ |
| In Mr. Wardrobe's hands .. ..              | £ | 17 | 14 | 6  |
|  |   |    |    | —  |

*Ordered*—“That a Rate of 6d. in the Pound be made for relief of “the poor.”

At a vestry held the 30th August, 1769. Bills left unpaid by Mr. Clewin.

|  |   |    |    |   |
|--|---|----|----|---|
| Milk to Slatt .. .. .. ..                | £ | 0  | 1  | 1 |
| Rushing's Rent .. .. .. ..               |   | 2  | 15 | 0 |
| Staines' Rent .. .. .. ..                |   | 3  | 0  | 0 |
| Edwin's Bill .. .. .. ..                 |   | 1  | 12 | 0 |
| Tragett .. .. .. ..                      |   | 0  | 5  | 0 |
| Relieved Parker .. .. .. ..              |   | 0  | 8  | 1 |
| Bindley for Widow Bonner's Rent .. .. .. |   | 2  | 0  | 0 |
| Brewer's Bill for Small Beer .. .. .. .. |   | 5  | 8  | 0 |
| Doctor's Salary .. .. .. ..              |   | 6  | 6  | 0 |
|  |   |    |    | — |
|  | £ | 21 | 15 | 2 |

The above Bills allowed to Mr. Clewin.

At a vestry held the 4th day of June, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Hill be paid thirteen pounds “for maintaining the poor” .. .. .. .. £13 0 0

(Signed) DANL. CLEWIN } WM. HILL } *Overseers of the Poor.*

Autographs of four Ratepayers.

Received 4th June, 1769, of Mr. Clewin, Overseer, the sum of thirteen pounds on account of maintaining the poor.

WM. HILL.

At a vestry held the 2nd day of July, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Hill be paid thirteen pounds “for maintaining the poor” .. .. .. .. £13 0 0

(Signed) DANL. CLEWIN } WM. HILL } *Overseers of the Poor.*

Autographs of three Ratepayers.

Received 2nd July, 1769, of Mr. Clewin, Overseer, the sum of thirteen pounds on account of maintaining the poor.

WM. HILL.

At a vestry held the 6th day of August, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Hill be paid thirteen pounds  
“for maintaining the poor” .. .. .. £13 0 0

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Clewin pay Mr. Bindley two pounds for a  
“year's rent due at Lady Day last, for the Widow Bonner.

(Signed) JOHN ECKEN, *Churchwarden.*  
DANL. CLEWIN }  
WM. HILL } *Overseers of the Poor.*

Autographs of four Ratepayers.

Received 6th August, 1769, of Mr. Clewin, thirteen pounds for  
maintaining the poor.

WM. HILL.

At a vestry held the 3rd day of September, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Hill be paid thirteen pounds for  
“the use of the poor.” .. .. .. .. £13 0 0

Signed DANL. CLEWIN }  
WM. HILL } *Overseers of the Poor.*  
And three Inhabitants.

Received 3rd September, 1769, of Mr. Clewin, Overseer, the sum  
of thirteen pounds on account for maintaining the poor.

WM. HILL.

At a vestry held the 22nd day of September, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex, for nominating surveyors for the ensuing year, the following persons were nominated:—

| EAST END.       | NORTH END.        |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| James White.    | John Jones.       |
| John Crow.      | James Nicoll.     |
| Willm. Cobley.  | Lawrence Castle.  |
| Richd. Roberts. | Willm. Smallbourn |
| Willm. Manhood. | Thos. Furnass.    |
| Robt. Jones.    |                   |

(Signed) JOHN ECKEN  
JOHN CROXFORD } *Churchwardens.*  
WM. HILL, *Overseer of the Poor.*  
J. DEANMER, *Constable.*  
And four Inhabitants.

October ye 1st, 1769.—At a vestry held this day, pursuant to notice given for that purpose, application was made by Mr. George Peters for a seat in the church.

*Ordered*—“ That Mr. George Peters have leave to fit up, at his own expence, a pew in the corner near to the christening font, and as long as he shall continue an inhabitant and householder in Finchley to keep the said pew in his own possession, and afterwards shall deliver it up to the parishioners to dispose of the same as they shall think proper.”

I agree to the above order, GEORGE PETERS.

At a vestry held the 1st day of October, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Hill be paid thirteen pounds for  
“maintaining the poor” .. . . . £13 0 0

*Ordered*—“That the churchwardens and overseers go to Mr. Wardrobe to know what day within one week he will attend the parishioners to settle his accounts at ye church house.”

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Eeken pay to Mr. John Kimpton five pounds seven shillings and nine pence for bread for the poor for ye year 1768, for which he is to be allowed.”

FINCHLEY, 19th Oct., 1769.

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Mr. Wardrobe met the parishioners this day and paid<br>into Mr. Clewin's hands .. .. .. ..                    | £2 18 7½ |
| By Bill .. .. .. ..   | 3 18 0   |
| Which with ten pounds ten shillings paid before to<br>Mr. Clewin, makes in full the balance of his accounts.. | 10 10 0  |
|   | £17 6 7½ |

The accounts of the overseers for the year 1768 being settled, there remains due to Mr. Clewin upon balance.. £0 14 2½

(Signed) DANL. CLEWIN } WM. HILL } Overseers of the Poor.  
And four Inhabitants.

At a vestry held the 5th day of November, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Hill be allowed thirteen pounds  
“for maintaining the poor.” .. .. .. £13 0 0

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Hague, the organist, be paid  
“five guineas out of the rates for his attendance on  
“the organ for the next season, to be paid him by  
“the overseer at Michaelmas next, and every year after  
“at Michaelmas, while Mr. Hague continues to do that  
“duty.” .. .. .. .. .. £5 5 0

*Ordered*—“And it is agreed that Mr. William Dawes  
“may enclose a piece of ground in Totteridge Lane  
“containing five and twenty yards in length and twelve  
“in breadth and no more, he paying yearly to the rent  
“roll two shillings and sixpence.” .. .. £0 2 6

“It is also agreed that Mr. Robert Wardrobe may  
“enclose a piece of ground in Totteridge Lane contain-  
“ing thirty feet in length and sixteen in breadth and  
“no more, he paying yearly one shilling to the rent  
“roll.” £0 1 0

*Ordered*—“That a vestry be called for Wednesday, the 15th  
“instant, at 12 of the clock to regulate the accounts of the parish,  
“when all persons who have any demands on the parish are desired  
“to attend.”

Signed      his  
JOHN X CROXFORD }  
mark  
JOHN ECKEN      } *Churchwardens.*  
DANL. CLEWIN }  
THOS. BISHOP } *Overseers of the Poor.*  
WM. HILL  
And fourteen Inhabitants.

At a vestry held the 15th day of November, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That a rate be made of 4d. in the Pound, to be col-  
“lected by Mr. John Ecken, Churchwarden. The bills underneath  
“mentioned to be paid out of the said rate.”

(Signed) JOHN ECKEN, *Churchwarden.*  
DANL. CLEWIN }  
THOS. BISHOP } *Overseers of the Poor.*  
WM. HILL  
And nine Inhabitants.

|                                  |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |
|----------------------------------|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|
| Mr. Edwin's Bill                 | .. | .. | .. | .. | £14 | 13 | 4½ |
| Mrs. Claridge's do.              | .. | .. | .. | .. | 12  | 13 | 0  |
| Mr. Jno. Ecken for Kimpton's do. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 5   | 7  | 9  |

|                 |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |
|-----------------|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|
| Carried forward | .. | .. | .. | .. | £32 | 14 | 1½ |
|-----------------|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|

|  |    |    |     |    |    |
|--|----|----|-----|----|----|
| Brought forward..                      | .. | .. | £32 | 14 | 1½ |
| Mr. Roberts for Rent ..                | .. | .. | 5   | 0  | 0  |
| Rent for Moore's to Michaelmas last .. | .. | .. | 3   | 15 | 0  |
| Mr. Bishop's Bill ..                   | .. | .. | 12  | 18 | 11 |
| Mr. Jones for half-year Salary ..      | .. | .. | 2   | 11 | 0  |
| Relieved Morriss ..                    | .. | .. | 2   | 14 | 0  |
| Mr. Joseph Eckens Bill ..              | .. | .. | 1   | 18 | 3½ |
|  |    |    |     |    |    |
|  |    |    | £61 | 11 | 4  |

At a vestry held the 3rd day of December, 1769, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Clewin pay Mr. Hill thirteen Pounds for maintaining the poor, it being Mr. Bishop's month to “pay.” .. .. .. .. .. .. £13 0 0

(Signed) JOHN ECKEN, *Churchwarden.*  
DANL. CLEWIN } *Overseers of the Poor.*  
WM. HILL }  
And three Inhabitants.

Received 3rd December, 1769, of Mr. Clewin, Overseer, thirteen pounds for maintaining the poor.

WM. HILL.

At a vestry held the 7th day of January, 1770, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Hill be paid thirteen pounds (by Mr. Bishop) “for maintaining the poor.” .. .. .. .. £13 0 0

That a vestry be called to meet on Wednesday, the 17th inst., to consider of the best way to put the bells in repair.

(Signed) JOHN CROXFORD } *Churchwardens.*  
JOHN ECKEN }  
DANL. CLEWIN }  
THOS. BISHOP } *Overseers of the Poor.*  
WM. HILL }  
And five Inhabitants.

At a vestry held the 17th day of January, 1770, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex, for putting the bells in repair.

*Ordered*—“That there be four new bells made to the first and “second to make a peal of six bells; and Mr. Samuel Turner agrees to “allow for the old metal in exchange as far as the weight of the new “ones, £4 12s. per cwt., and £4 4s. for every cwt. that is above the “weight exchanged. The charges of taking down the old bells, new

" hanging the new ones, the carriage and all the expenses for thirty-seven pounds. And to keep the bells in repair for the first year and " the frames and wheels, &c., for twenty years to come at 3s. per year  
" The money to be paid Mr. Turner at Easter, 1771."

(Signed) JOHN ECKEN, *Churchwarden.*  
THOS. BISHOP, *Overseer of the Poor.*

And three Inhabitants.

ROBT. JONES, *Vestry Clerk.*

FINCHLEY, 4th Feby., 1770.

It appearing that the second bell is faulty, it is ordered that the said bell be new cast.

At a vestry held the 4th day of February, 1770, in and for the parish of Finchley, in ye county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—" That Mr Hill be paid thirteen pounds for maintaining " the poor." Paid by Mr. Clewin.

(Signed) JOHN ECKEN, *Churchwarden.*  
WM. HILL, *Overseer of the Poor.*  
And five Inhabitants.

Received 4th Feb., 1770, of Mr. Clewin, Overseer, thirteen pounds for maintaining the poor.

WM. HILL.

At a vestry held the 4th day of March, 1770, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—" That Mr. Clewin, Overseer, pay Mr.  
" Hill thirteen pounds for maintaining the poor" .. £13 0 0

(Signed) DAN. CLEWIN } *Overseers of the Poor.*  
WM. HILL }  
And four Inhabitants.

Received 4th March, 1770, of Mr. Clewin, thirteen pounds for maintaining the poor.

WM. HILL.

At a vestry held the 1st day of April, 1770, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—" That Mr. Clewin, Overseer, pay Mr. Hill  
" thirteen pounds for maintaining the poor" .. £13 0 0

(Signed) DAN. CLEWIN } *Overseers of the Poor.*  
THOS. BISHOP }  
WM. HILL }  
And six Inhabitants.

Received 1st April, 1770, of Mr. Clewin, Overseer, thirteen pounds for maintaining the poor.

WM. HILL.

At a vestry held the 4th day of April, 1770, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex, for making a Rate for the necessary relief of the poor.

*Ordered*—“That a rate of 4d. in the Pound be made for the relief of the poor.”

(Signed) JOHN ECKEN, *Churchwarden.*

DANL. CLEWIN  
THOS. BISHOP } *Overseers of the Poor.*

WM. HILL  
And four Inhabitants.

**VESTRY MINUTES OF FINCHLEY.  
NOTES AS TO YEAR BEGINNING EASTER  
SUNDAY, 1798.**

During this year the monthly vestries of the parish were held on the last Sunday in the month after the evening service. The number of vestries between Easter 1798 and Easter 1799 was 20. The rateable value of the parish was £6,847, the population at the first census of 1801 was 1,503.

The poor rates amounted to 2s. in the Pound. All expenses, including highways and sanitary, were still paid out of the poor rate.

Up to Easter, 1794, the inhabitants were in the habit of appointing both Churchwardens, one for the North End and the other for the East End, but after that year the practice came into use of allowing the Rector to appoint one of the Churchwardens.

The inhabitants had in previous years discontinued the system of letting the poor, the parish itself managing all poor relief matters, and allowing at their meetings the various payments made by the Overseers; but in July, 1798, the vestry entered into an agreement with Mr. Penn to farm such of the poor as should be sent to him at 3s. 9d. per head, and the accounts of the year shew many transactions with him thereunder. These payments are very interesting and shew the character of parish expenditure as it was at the end of the last century.

At a special meeting of the inhabitants of the parish of Finchley and the adjoining parish of Friern Barnet, held in the parish church of Finchley, on the 12th May,

1798, the inhabitants resolved that a corps of infantry should be formed under the denomination of Finchley and Friern Barnet volunteers for the defence of the county.

At a subsequent meeting of the two parishes held on the 28th May, subscriptions were put down to the amount of £75 7s. 6d.

In the following month of June, however, the government determined that they could not recommend any offers of assistance for the defence of parishes to be entertained, and it was therefore resolved to refund the subscriptions which had been collected.

On the 13th March, 1799, the vestry resolved to apply to the Bishop of London, the Lord of the Manor of Finchley, for leave to enclose a piece of waste ground for the erection of a workhouse for the use of the parish.

In April, 1799, is recorded the resolution of the inhabitants to meet their neighbours of St. Pancras and Hornsey (conterminous parishes) upon the matter of the beating of their bounds, and on the same day to perform this ceremony for Finchley parish.

---

1798-99.

#### MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

##### COPY VESTRY MINUTES FOR YEAR BEGINNING EASTER, 1798, AND ENDING EASTER, 1799.

At a vestry held on the 10th day of April, 1798, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex, pursuant to notice given in the church the preceding Sunday, for the purpose of choosing churchwardens and nominating overseers of the poor for the said parish for the year ensuing.

##### EAST END.

*Churchwardens :*  
John Grocock XXXXX  
James Tomlinson X  
Thomas Verrals XX

*Overseers :*  
William Steer, Esq.  
Thomas Godson.  
Davis.

(Signed)

##### NORTH END.

*Churchwardens :*  
John Garratt XXXXX  
James Webb X  
John Hunt XX

*Overseers :*  
William Yarnold, Esq.  
Thomas Wilkinson.  
Lyon.

J. GROCOCK, }  
J. GARRATT, } *Churchwardens.*  
THOS. SINGLETON, *Overseer.*  
And 7 Inhabitants.

*Ordered*—“That the monthly vestries of this parish for the future be held on the last Sunday of every succeeding month in the evening after divine service.

“And that the allowance of One shilling to George Audsley for attending the vestry be discontinued.”

*Ordered*—“That Henry Rudd, the present common driver, his salary paid by the parish be discontinued for the future.”

At a Vestry held the 29th day of April, 1798, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the County of Middlesex :—

*Ordered*—“That Thomas Singleton, Esqre., the present East End Overseer, be allowed the undermentioned Bills and Disbursements” :—

|       |       | £ s. d.  |
|-------|-------|--|
| Mar.  | 29th. | Paid for a letter upon parish business .. 0 0 2  |
| “     | 30th. | Relieved a pass .. 0 0 6   |
| April | 2nd.  | Paid Mr. Kerridge for carriage of furzes to the poor house .. 0 4 0                        |
|       |       | Paid for a letter about Ann Mark's child .. 0 0 2  |
|       |       | Paid for nursing six children one week .. 1 1 0  |
|       |       | Paid for schooling for six children one week 0 1 6   |
|       |       | Relieved two passes .. 0 1 0   |
| April | 3rd.  | Relieved one pass .. 0 0 4   |
| “     | 4th.  | Relieved Mrs. Marsh by order of Esquire Bacon .. 0 5 9                                     |
| “     | 5th.  | Paid Mr. Bott for a barrow for the poor house 0 13 0                                       |
| “     | 6th.  | Relieved two passes, 1s.; 7th, relieved one pass, 6d. .. 0 1 6                             |
| “     | 8th.  | Paid for a pair of shoes for Mrs. Wattle .. 0 6 0  |
|       |       | Paid for two pair of handcuffs .. 0 11 0   |
|       |       | Relieved a pass .. 0 0 6   |
|       |       | Paid Henry Rudd, the common driver, his salary .. 3 13 6                                   |
| “     | 9th.  | Paid for nursing six children one week .. 1 1 0  |
|       |       | Paid for schooling for six children one week 0 1 6   |
| “     | 10th. | Relieved a pass .. 0 0 6   |
|       |       | Gave Edward Marshes' wife .. 0 1 0   |
|       |       | Paid expenses at the vestry, nominating officers on Easter Tuesday .. 1 1 0                |
|       |       | Paid for 2 ewt. of potatoes .. 0 8 0   |
| “     | 11th. | Paid Bonnor for eleven weeks' pension, at 3s. 6d.. .. 2 9 0                                |
| “     | 12th. | Paid for Ann Mark's child for ten weeks, at 2s. 6d. per week, to the 16th instant .. 1 5 0 |
|       |       | Paid for clothing for Ann Mark's child .. 0 10 6   |
|       |       | Expenses going to town about parish business 0 5 0   |
|       |       | Relieved a pass .. 0 1 0   |
|       |       | <hr/> Carried forward.. .. £14 3 5   |

|   |  |      |     |       |
|---|--|------|-----|-------|
|   | Brought forward .. .. ..   | £14  | 5   | 3     |
| April 13th.   | Relieved two passes .. .. ..   | 0    | 1   | 3     |
|   | Relieved a pass .. .. ..   | 0    | 0   | 9     |
|   | Gave George Audsley for his attending the vestry on Easter Tuesday .. .. ..                                    | 0    | 1   | 0     |
| ,, 14th.  | Paid Mr. Laman the remainder of his bill   | 9    | 9   | 0     |
| ,, 16th.  | Paid for the nursing six children one week   | 1    | 1   | 0     |
|   | Paid for schooling for six children one week   | 0    | 1   | 6     |
|   | Paid for ointment for the child's head ..  | 0    | 1   | 6     |
|   | Paid for a pair of shoes for Webb's infant ..  | 0    | 1   | 1     |
|   | Relieved a pass 9d., ditto another 3d. ..  | 0    | 1   | 0     |
|   | Paid Mr. Eckens for a day's work at drift cart .. .. ..  | 0    | 12  | 0     |
|   | Relieved a pass 3d., ditto another 9d. ..  | 0    | 1   | 0     |
| April 19th, 20th & 21st.                            | Relieved passes when I was in Kent .. .. ..  | 0    | 1   | 9     |
| 23rd.   | Paid for nursing six children one week ..  | 1    | 1   | 0     |
|   | Paid for schooling six children one week ..  | 0    | 1   | 6     |
|   | Relieved a pass .. .. ..   | 0    | 0   | 3     |
|   | Paid at the court at Highgate .. .. ..   | 1    | 0   | 0     |
|   | Relieved Mrs. Aedy .. .. ..  | 0    | 2   | 6     |
| ,, 26th.  | Paid for a letter from the Marquis of Titchfield .. .. ..  | 0    | 0   | 2     |
| ,, 27th.  | Relieved John Claridge .. .. ..  | 0    | 3   | 0     |
|   | Relieved a pass .. .. ..   | 0    | 0   | 9     |
|   | Relieved a pass—man and wife and seven children .. .. ..   | 0    | 1   | 6     |
| ,, 28th.  | Paid Mrs. Plumber's family, from the 31st October to the 28th inst., twenty-six weeks at 6s. per week .. .. .. | 7    | 16  | 0     |
|   | Paid Mr. Grocock, as per bill .. .. ..   | 1    | 8   | 0     |
|   | Paid Mr. Crouch his bill .. .. ..  | 1    | 10  | 0     |
|   | Paid Mr. Jaques, as per bill, for meat .. .. ..  | 3    | 13  | 9     |
|   | Paid Mr. Bean, as per bill, for bread .. .. ..   | 5    | 0   | 7     |
|   | Paid part of the East End pensioners, as per bill .. .. ..   | 8    | 4   | 0     |
|   | Paid for the constables' staffs .. .. ..   | 0    | 14  | 3     |
| ,, 29th.  | Paid the usual allowance of this vestry ..   | 0    | 3   | 6     |
|   |  | 56   | 16  | 9     |
|   | Relieved Mrs. Aedy .. .. ..  | 0    | 4   | 0     |
|   |  | 57   | 0   | 9     |
| Mr. Singleton's eight former vestries brought on .. |  | ..   | 486 | 10 11 |
|   |  |      |     | ===== |
|   |  | £543 | 11  | 8     |
|   |  |      |     | ===== |

*Ordered.*—“That Mr. Corp, the Surgeon, be presented with three guineas for cures he has performed on Maria Choice and the widow “Harris’s child’s wen on its eye.”

(Signed)      J. GROCOCK }  
                  J. GARRATT } *Churhwardens.*

THOMAS SINGLETON }  
T. H. ANDREW } *Overseers of the Poor.*  
And 6 Inhabitants.

#### MIDDLESEX.

At a Special General Meeting of the Lord Lieutenant and Deputy Lieutenants of the said County, held at the Guildhall, Westminster, on Tuesday, the 24th day of April, 1798, the most Noble the Marquis of Titchfield, Lord Lieutenant, in the Chair.

This meeting was held for the purpose of taking into consideration an Act of this Session entitled “An Act to enable his Majesty more effectually to provide for the defence and security of the realm “during the present war, and for indemnifying persons who may “suffer in their property by such measures as may be necessary for “that purpose.” And also a letter from the Right Honourable Henry Dundas to the Lord Lieutenant recommending the formation of armed associations consisting of known and respectable householders, or of persons who can at least bring two such householders to answer for their good behaviour.

*Resolved*—“That all persons of the above description willing to be “armed and exercised for the public defence within their own neighbour-hood, or in any other manner to associate and hold themselves “in readiness to act for the preservation of the public tranquillity, be “requested to send in their names and places of abode, together with “the nature of the service they propose, directed to the Lord “Lieutenant of the County of Middlesex, at the Guildhall, in King “Street, Westminster, as soon as possible. And in parishes where “associations are already formed or forming, the names may be ex-“pressed individually or the total number only, as to the parties may “seem meet; or to deliver the same so directed to the constable of “their respective parish to be by him delivered to the high constable of “the division who has direction to transmit the same to the Guildhall “aforesaid.”

*Resolved*—“That all persons willing to furnish, in case of emergency, carts or horses for the public service gratuitously or for hire “be requested in like manner to signify their proposals, together with “the number they are willing to furnish.”

*Resolved*—“That this meeting be adjourned to Tuesday next, the “1st of May, at one o’clock at noon, for the purpose of taking into “consideration the above returns.”

“L. STABLE,  
“Clerk of the General Meetings of the said County.”  
(Copy.)

---

*May 3rd, 1798.*

At a meeting held this day in the parish of Finchley and in the parish of Friern Barnet, in both of the said parish churches, pursuant to notice given in the said churches on Sunday last, for the purpose of adopting measures for the defence of the county at the present alarming crisis.

Present—

John Bacon, Esquire, Deputy Lieutenant, in the Chair.

The Rev. Ralph Worsley, *Rector.*

T. H. Andrews, Esquire      }  
Thomas Singleton, Esquire    } *Overseers of the Poor.*

John Grocock, }  
John Garratt,      } *Churchwardens.*

Lawrence Lyon.

John Roberts.

William Clark.

John Simpson.

Henry Williams.

James Tarling.

James Butt.

John Claridge.

James Leg.

Thomas Venalls.

James Frost.

There being no returns of the constable of the precepts ordered by the lieutenancy of the county, of the ages of the various inhabitants of Finchley from 15 to 60 years of age, and the meeting thinking it essentially necessary that such return should be made before any association or resolution should be entered into—

*Ordered*—“ That this meeting do adjourn to Saturday the 12th instant, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon precisely. And that the parishioners of Friern Barnet be requested to attend at the Finchley meeting.”

---

*May 12th, 1798.*

At a special meeting of the inhabitants of the parishes of Finchley and Friern Barnet jointly in the Parish Church of Finchley by adjournment from the 3rd instant, pursuant to notice given in the said parish churches for the purpose of taking into consideration the before mentioned resolutions.

At a meeting of the inhabitants of the Parishes of Finchley and Friern Barnet, held in the Parish Church of Finchley, for the purpose of adopting measures for the defence of the Country at the present alarming crisis,

John Bacon, Esquire, in the chair.

*It was Resolved*—“ I. That a corps of infantry be formed under the denomination of the Finchley and Friern Barnet Volunteers, to be trained in military exercise within the parishes of Finchley and Friern Barnet aforesaid.”

“ II. That each person joining this association shall enter his name and place of abode, and sign the following declaration.

“ We, the undersigned, declaring our zealous attachment to the king and constitution of these realms, do hereby engage to associate for the defence of the persons and property of the inhabitants of these parishes for the preservation of internal tranquillity, and the assistance of the civil magistrates in cases of emergency.

“ III. That a committee consisting of the following gentlemen, three of whom shall constitute a quorum, have the power of approving or rejecting all such persons as may offer themselves to be enrolled, and that they have also the power of expelling from this association any member whose disobedience of orders or neglect of duty or other misconduct may appear to them to merit such disgrace.”

The Committee.

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| “ John Bacon, Esq., Dep. Lieut. | Sir Thos. Pasley, Bart.                                |
| “ Rev. R. Worsley.              | Rev. A. Lake.  |
| “ Thos. Collins, Esq.           | Saml. Hawkins, Esq.                                    |
| “ The Churchwardens of Finchley | The Churchwardens of Friern Barnet for the time being. |
| “ for the time being.           | John Pasley, Esq.                                      |
| “ Thos. Gildarst, Esq.          | Mr. Lawrence Lyon.                                     |
| “ Thos. Lermitté, Esq.          | Mr. Henry Williams.                                    |
| “ James Butt, Esq.              | Mr. William Clark.                                     |
| “ Mr. Thos. Singleton.          | Mr. Wm. Tay.   |
| “ Thos. Andrews, Esq.           |  |
| “ Mr. Benj. Bradbury.           |  |

“ IV. That no member of the association shall be liable to serve out of the limits of these parishes without his own individual consent.

“ V. That the corps shall act together and shall not be drafted, neither the whole or in part into any other corps.

“ VI. That the officers be recommended to the Lord Lieutenant of the county of Middlesex by the Committee, with a request that they may receive commissions from his Majesty.”

“ VII. That every member of the corps shall be ready to attend in case any fire should take place in either of these parishes caused by accident or design, on being summoned by beat of drum or otherwise.

“ VIII. That such members of this Association who may have property in London or elsewhere and may be called upon for the protection of it shall not, by these resolutions, be precluded from so doing if they give notice of the necessity of their absence from hence to the Committee or the commanding officer.

“ IX. That any member of this Association being desirous to withdraw himself from it may do so on his delivering up the arms and accoutrements which he may have received from the Association, and giving six days' notice of such his intention to the Committee.

“ X. That the arms, accoutrements and ammunition be provided by Government, and the dress by the corps.

“ XI. That the uniform shall consist of a dark blue cloth coat or “ jacket with red collar and narrowed edging, yellow buttons, with

“ the letters  thereon, a white kerseymere waistcoat with

“ yellow buttons, pantaloons of Russia duck, black stock, and hat to “ pattern.

“ XII. That a subscription be opened for the defraying of all such “ expenses as may be necessarily incurred on account of the Associa- “ tion, and that the churchwardens of the parishes, attended by at “ least two of the Committee, be requested to collect the same.

“ XIII. That John Bacon, Esq., be appointed treasurer to the “ Association.

“ XIV. That the foregoing resolutions be left at the Rev. Mr. Worsley's, at the Rev. Mr. Lake's, and at the churchwardens of each parish for the signature of such persons as may be disposed either to enrol themselves or subscribe in aid of the Association, that they be printed and distributed in handbills throughout the parishes, and that the chairman be requested to send them as soon as may be convenient to the Lord Lieutenant of the county for the approbation of His Majesty.

“ XV. That the Committee be empowered to call the future general meetings whenever it shall appear to them to be necessary, or at any time when required so to do by a requisition in writing, signed by five or more members of this Association.

“ JOHN BACON, *Chairman.*”

*Resolved*—“ That the thanks of this meeting be given to the chairman for his great attention to the purposes of the Association.”

---

FINCHLEY, May 19th, 1798.

At a meeting of the Committee for conducting the business of the Armed Association for the parishes of Finchley and Friern Barnet, the several resolutions entered into at the last general meeting were read over, as signed by the chairman, and as the meeting was not very numerous—

*Resolved*—“ That this meeting do adjourn to Monday, the 28th instant, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon, and that the Committee be summoned by Wm. Smallbourn, the vestry clerk, for that hour precisely, to take into consideration and adopt the most prompt measures for effectually putting in force the resolutions of the general meeting of this Association.”

---

At a vestry held in the Parish Church of Finchley, in the County of Middlesex, on Wednesday, the 23rd day of May, 1798, pursuant to notice given in the said Church, on Sunday last, for the purpose of examining and settling the accounts of the late overseers of the poor of the said parish for the last year, and from thence adjourned to the Church House in the said parish.

Thos. Singleton, Esq., the late East End Overseer, his account stands as under:—

Mr. Singleton hath disbursed by nine former  
vestrys as are entered in this book to  
the 29th April last .. .. £543 11 8

And Mr. Singleton has disbursed since as under:—

|             |  |    |    |    |      |    |   |  |
|-------------|--|----|----|----|------|----|---|--|
| 1798.       |  |    |    |    |      |    |   |  |
| April 30th. | Gave to 3 passes .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 0  | 9 |  |
|             | Paid for nursing 6 children 1 week .. ..   | .. | .. | .. | 1    | 1  | 0 |  |
|             | Paid schooling for ditto .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 1  | 6 |  |
| May 1st.    | Paid to 2 passes .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 1  | 6 |  |
| ,, 2nd.     | To a ditto .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 0  | 4 |  |
| ,, 3rd      | Paid at a meeting of the inhabitants for<br>adopting measures for the defence of<br>the country .. .. ..   | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 1  | 6 |  |
| ,, 4th.     | Gave to a pass .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 1  | 0 |  |
| ,, 5th.     | Expenses attending the magistrates at High-<br>gate respecting the summoning several<br>for the poor rate .. .. ..   | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 11 | 0 |  |
|             | Paid Mrs. Marsh up to the 7th May at 6s.<br>per week, received the difference before<br>as settled for 8 weeks, her husband<br>being a substitute for a servant of Wm.<br>Hamerton's, Esq., that was drawn for<br>the Militia .. .. .. | .. | .. | .. | 1    | 17 | 0 |  |
|             | Paid Jas. Franklin the constables' extra bill ..   | .. | .. | .. | 1    | 1  | 0 |  |
|             | Paid expenses of James Harper to St.<br>Bartholomew's Hospital horse and<br>cart .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 7  | 6 |  |
| ,, 6th.     | Paid Mrs. Aedy .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 7  | 0 |  |
|             | Gave to a pass .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 0  | 4 |  |
|             | Paid for Mary Bateman's child up to the 23rd<br>May at per week 2s. 6d. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 1    | 10 | 0 |  |
| ,, 12th.    | Paid George Audsley for attending the<br>Association meeting .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 1  | 6 |  |
|             | Gave to a pass .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 1  | 0 |  |
| ,, 14th.    | Paid for nursing 6 children 2 weeks .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 2    | 2  | 0 |  |
|             | Paid schooling for ditto .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 3  | 0 |  |
|             | Relieved Mrs. Aedy .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 3  | 6 |  |
|             | Paid Edward Marshe's wife for 1 week .. ..   | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 6  | 0 |  |
| ,, 15th.    | Gave to 2 passes .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 1  | 3 |  |
| ,, 16th.    | To ditto 3d., to ditto 9d. .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 1  | 0 |  |
| ,, 18th.    | Relieved Mrs. Winterburn .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 3  | 6 |  |
|             | Paid Bonner for 6 weeks up to the 23rd inst. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 1    | 1  | 0 |  |
|             | Gave a pass 1s. 3d., gave a ditto 6d. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 1  | 9 |  |
| ,, 20th.    | Relieved Mrs. Aedy .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 3  | 6 |  |
| ,, 21st.    | Paid for nursing 6 children 1 week .. ..   | .. | .. | .. | 1    | 1  | 0 |  |
|             | Paid schooling for ditto .. .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 1  | 6 |  |
|             | Carried forward .. ..  | .. | .. | .. | £556 | 4  | 7 |  |

|           |   |      |    |     |
|-----------|---|------|----|-----|
|           | Brought forward ..  | £556 | 4  | 7   |
| May 22nd. | Paid Edward Marshe's wife for 1 week ..                                       | 0    | 6  | 0   |
|           | Paid Mr. Corp, the surgeon, by order of last vestry .. .. .. ..               | 3    | 3  | 0   |
|           | Paid Jas. Franklin, the constable, his salary ..                              | 5    | 5  | 0   |
|           | Paid Mr. Drake as per bill .. .. ..   | 1    | 4  | 8½  |
|           | Paid for Ann Mark's child up to the 21st inst. .. .. .. ..                    | 0    | 12 | 6   |
|           | Expenses going to Bethnal Green .. ..   | 0    | 18 | 2   |
|           | Paid Richd. Cousing's bill up to the 1st January last .. .. .. ..             | 23   | 7  | 6   |
|           | Paid for clothing John Brown, by order ..                                     | 1    | 8  | 0   |
|           | Paid Mr. Harding for shaving the poor ..                                      | 0    | 7  | 10  |
|           | Relieved a pass .. .. .. ..   | 0    | 1  | 0   |
|           | Relieved Mrs. Buggins .. .. .. ..   | 0    | 5  | 0   |
|           | Paid Mrs. Tarling as per bill for Mrs. Maull ..                               | 0    | 17 | 8   |
|           | Paid Mrs. Mallard for Pedley's girls' schooling .. .. .. ..                   | 0    | 8  | 1   |
|           | Paid Mr. Drake as per bill .. .. ..   | 0    | 9  | 2½  |
| ,, 23rd.  | Paid Mr. Legg for the pensioners for four weeks up to the 21st inst. .. ..    | 8    | 4  | 0   |
|           | Gave a pass .. .. .. ..   | 0    | 0  | 6   |
|           | Paid Mr. Verrals as per bill shop goods and clothing for the poor .. .. .. .. | 12   | 7  | 11½ |
|           | Gave to two passes .. .. .. ..  | 0    | 1  | 0   |
|           | Paid Mr. Young as per bill .. .. ..   | 0    | 11 | 6   |
|           | Paid Mr. Herridge as per bill, for White's lodging, &c., to the 18th inst. .. | 1    | 17 | 0   |
|           | Paid for a pair of shoes for Mrs. Friend ..                                   | 0    | 4  | 6   |
|           | Paid to a pass .. .. .. ..  | 0    | 1  | 0   |
|           | Paid Geo. Audsley for this day's attendance ..                                | 0    | 1  | 0   |
|           |   | £618 | 6  | 8½  |

Per Contra Cr. Mr. Singleton has received:—

## 1797.

June 28th. By a rate book at 1s. in the pound amounting to £247 0 0

Nov. 29th. By a ditto at 1s. in the pound 243 17 0

## 1798.

March 28th. By a ditto at 6d. in the pound 121 17 0

Received from Mr. Clark his Balance .. .. 6 15 11½

Received from Richd. Brown for a bastard .. .. 15 14 6

|                    |      |   |    |      |   |    |
|--------------------|------|---|----|------|---|----|
| Carried forward .. | £635 | 4 | 5½ | £618 | 6 | 8½ |
|--------------------|------|---|----|------|---|----|

|  |                    |      |    |    |      |   |    |
|--|--------------------|------|----|----|------|---|----|
|  | Brought forward .. | £635 | 4  | 5½ | £618 | 6 | 8½ |
| Received of Mr. Coltlove<br>for arrears to the poor<br>rate .. .. ..   | 0                  | 7    | 0  |    |      |   |    |
| Received of Mr. Hill for<br>the same .. .. ..  | 4                  | 8    | 0  |    |      |   |    |
| Received from the parish of<br>St. Lawrence for James<br>Miller's wife .. .. ..  | 1                  | 8    | 0  |    |      |   |    |
| Total received ..  | £611               | 7    | 5½ |    |      |   |    |
| East End. { Uncollected in the first rate .. .. .. 7 9 0<br>In the second ditto .. .. .. 7 17 0<br>In the third ditto .. .. .. 5 4 0 |                    |      |    |    |      |   |    |
| Total disbursed .. .. ..   | £638               | 16   | 8½ |    |      |   |    |
| Balance due to the parish .. .. ..   | £2                 | 10   | 9  |    |      |   |    |

The particulars of the deficiencies uncollected in the following rate books as under :—

| EAST END—First Rate. |    |    | Third Rate. |                        |          |
|----------------------|----|----|-------------|------------------------|----------|
| Mrs. Butler .. ..    | £0 | 6  | 0           | Mrs. Butler .. ..      | £0 3 0   |
| William Dodd .. ..   | 0  | 5  | 0           | Esquire Cornwalls ..   | 3 0 0    |
| Mrs. Griffith .. ..  | 2  | 10 | 0           | Do. late Greenhills .. | 0 6 0    |
| Mr. Holden .. ..     | 1  | 10 | 0           | Mr. Durant .. ..       | 0 5 0    |
| Thomas Smith .. ..   | 0  | 7  | 0           | Mr. Holden .. ..       | 0 15 0   |
| Major Scott .. ..    | 2  | 7  | 0           | Mr. Nicholay .. ..     | 0 15 0   |
| Mr. Taunton .. ..    | 0  | 4  | 0           |                        |          |
|                      | £7 | 9  | 0           | Total .. ..            | £20 10 0 |

#### *Second Rate.*

|                                 |    |    |   |
|---------------------------------|----|----|---|
| Esquire Cornwall, empty ..      | £1 | 10 | 0 |
| Do. for Greenhills ..           | 0  | 12 | 0 |
| William Dodd, poor ..           | 0  | 5  | 0 |
| Mr. Durrand, gone<br>away .. .. | 0  | 10 | 0 |
| Mr. Holden, empty ..            | 1  | 10 | 0 |
| Mr. Overton do. ..              | 0  | 16 | 0 |
| Major Scott do. ..              | 2  | 7  | 0 |
| Thomas Schofield, poor ..       | 0  | 7  | 0 |

£7 17 0

#### *NORTH END—First Rate.*

|                          |    |    |   |
|--------------------------|----|----|---|
| Thomas Beach .. ..       | £6 | 12 | 0 |
| Dearman .. ..            | 0  | 8  | 0 |
| Mr. Farmer, overrated .. | 9  | 4  | 0 |
| Mr. Heath .. ..          | 0  | 5  | 0 |
| Mr. Jennings X .. ..     | 0  | 7  | 0 |
| Mr. Cruchley, empty ..   | 2  | 0  | 0 |
| Mr. Sereas X .. ..       | 0  | 10 | 0 |

North End uncollected  
Carried forward £4 6 0

|   |  |
|---|--|
| North End uncollected<br>brought up .. £4 6 0 | North End uncollected<br>brought up .. £1 16 0 |
| Mr. Tarling X .. 0 10 0                       | Dr. Blane do. .. 0 7 6                         |
| Joshua Taylor, poor .. 0 10 0                 | Mrs. Crutchley X .. 1 10 0                     |
| £5 6 0  | Mr. Dixon, Iona. .. 0 5 0                      |
|   | Deemer .. .. 0 4 6                             |
|   | Thomas Heath .. .. 0 2 6                       |
|   | Mr. Hill X .. .. 1 15 0                        |
| Second Rate.                                  | Mr. Jennings X .. .. 0 3 6                     |
| Thomas Beach .. 0 12 0                        | Mr. Lyon X .. .. 0 13 6                        |
| Deemer .. .. 0 8 0                            | Mr. Parr X .. .. 0 3 0                         |
| Dr. Blaine, empty .. 0 15 0                   | John Ray X .. .. 0 3 6                         |
| Thomas Heath .. .. 0 5 0                      | Mr. Aekin .. .. 1 4 0                          |
| Mr. Jennings X .. .. 0 7 0                    | Mr. Sanders X .. .. 0 6 0                      |
| John Ray X .. .. 0 7 0                        | Esquire Steer X .. .. 1 1 0                    |
| Mr. Screas X .. .. 0 10 0                     | Mr. Screas X .. .. 0 5 0                       |
| Mr. Tarling X .. .. 0 10 0                    | Mr. Spencer X .. .. 2 5 0                      |
| Joshua Taylor .. .. 0 10 0                    | Mr. Tarling X .. .. 0 5 0                      |
| £4 4 0  | Joshua Taylor, poor .. 0 5 0                   |
|   | £12 15 0                                       |
| Third Rate.                                   |  |
| Thomas Beach .. £0 6 0                        |  |
| Esquire Bird, empty .. 1 10 0                 |  |
| North End uncollected                         | Total of the North                             |
| carried forward .. £1 16 0                    | End uncollected £22 5 0                        |

T. H. Andrew, Esq., the late North End Overseer has disbursed as under and not entered in this book before :—

|            |   |          |
|------------|---|----------|
| March 3rd. | Paid the weekly pensioners at the North End                           | £1 15 6  |
|            | Paid Hngh Jordan .. .. ..   | 0 7 0    |
| „ 10th.    | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..                                   | 1 15 6   |
|            | Paid Hugh Jordan .. .. ..   | 0 7 0    |
|            | Paid George Beach's lodgings .. .. ..                                 | 0 8 0    |
|            | Relieved a pass seven in number .. .. ..                              | 0 2 0    |
| „ 17th.    | Paid the weekly pensions .. .. ..                                     | 1 15 6   |
|            | Paid Hugh Jordan .. .. ..   | 0 7 0    |
|            | Relieved three passes .. .. ..  | 0 1 3    |
| „ 24th.    | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..                                   | 1 15 6   |
|            | Paid Hugh Jordan .. .. ..   | 0 7 0    |
| „ 27th.    | Relieved a pass seven women soldiers' wives and two children .. .. .. | 0 10 6   |
|            | Relieved a ditto, five women ditto, and sixteen children .. .. ..     | 0 7 0    |
|            | Relieved a ditto, six women ditto, and seventeen children .. .. ..    | 0 10 6   |
|            | Relieved a ditto, women ditto, and nineteen children .. .. ..         | 0 10 6   |
|            | Carried forward ..  | £10 19 9 |

|            |   | Brought forward .. | £ | 10 | 19 | 9 |
|------------|---|--------------------|---|----|----|---|
| March 8th. | Relieved a ditto .. .. ..   | 0 7 0              |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved a ditto .. .. ..   | 0 5 0              |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved seven soldiers' wives and nineteen<br>children .. .. ..        | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved seven ditto and twenty-four<br>children .. .. ..               | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved seven ditto and twenty-one children .. .. ..                   | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved seven ditto and twenty-eight ditto .. .. ..                    | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved nine ditto and twenty-nine ditto .. .. ..                      | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved seven ditto and twenty-eight ditto .. .. ..                    | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved eight ditto and thirty ditto .. .. ..                          | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved eight ditto and twenty-seven ditto .. .. ..                    | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved seven ditto and twenty-five ditto .. .. ..                     | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved eight ditto and twenty-three ditto .. .. ..                    | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved five ditto and fifteen ditto .. .. ..                          | 0 5 0              |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved six ditto and nineteen ditto .. .. ..                          | 0 7 0              |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved seven ditto and twenty-eight ditto .. .. ..                    | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved six ditto and twenty-one ditto .. .. ..                        | 0 7 0              |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved eight ditto and twenty-three ditto .. .. ..                    | 0 7 0              |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved nine ditto and twenty-nine ditto .. .. ..                      | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
| ,, 31st.   | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..                                     | 1 15 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Paid Hugh Jordan .. .. ..   | 0 7 0              |   |    |    |   |
| April 2nd. | Relieved soldiers' wives and children .. .. ..                          | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved ditto and ditto .. .. ..                                       | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved ditto and ditto .. .. ..                                       | 0 10 6             |   |    |    |   |
| ,, 7th.    | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..                                     | 1 15 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Paid George Beach's lodgings .. .. ..                                   | 0 8 0              |   |    |    |   |
|            | Paid for a bedstead, &c., for George Beach .. .. ..                     | 2 12 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Paid Hugh Jordan .. .. ..   | 0 7 0              |   |    |    |   |
| ,, 10th.   | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0 0 6              |   |    |    |   |
| ,, 14th.   | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..                                     | 1 15 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Paid Hugh Jordan .. .. ..   | 0 7 0              |   |    |    |   |
| ,, 16th.   | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0 0 6              |   |    |    |   |
| ,, 21st.   | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..                                     | 1 13 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Paid Hugh Jordan .. .. ..   | 0 7 0              |   |    |    |   |
|            | Gave Thomas Beach's wife .. .. ..                                       | 0 4 0              |   |    |    |   |
| ,, 28th.   | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..                                     | 1 13 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Paid Hugh Jordan .. .. ..   | 0 7 0              |   |    |    |   |
|            | Gave Thomas Beach's wife .. .. ..                                       | 0 4 0              |   |    |    |   |
|            | Paid George Beach's lodgings .. .. ..                                   | 0 6 0              |   |    |    |   |
|            | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0 0 6              |   |    |    |   |
| May 5th.   | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..                                     | 1 13 6             |   |    |    |   |
|            | Paid Hugh Jordan .. .. ..   | 0 7 0              |   |    |    |   |
|            | Gave Thomas Beach .. .. ..  | 0 4 0              |   |    |    |   |
| ,, 10th.   | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0 0 3              |   |    |    |   |
| ,, 19th.   | Paid George Audsley for attending the<br>meeting at the church .. .. .. | 0 1 6              |   |    |    |   |
|            | Carried forward .. .. ..  | £37 6 0            |   |    |    |   |

|           |   |          |
|-----------|---|----------|
|           | Brought forward .. ..   | £37 6 0  |
| May 19th. | Paid Mr. Garratt a bill for relief to Mrs. Turpin and Mrs. Lawson .. ..   | 1 3 11   |
|           | Paid Mr. Bird for Richard Smith's rent to Lady Day last and stamp thirty-nine weeks at 2s. per week .. .. ..      | 3 18 2   |
|           | Paid to Militia men's wives by order of Esquire Collins .. .. ..  | 0 12 0   |
|           | Paid Mr. Wardrop's bill for glaziers work done at Blundells and the poorhouse ..                                  | 0 18 11  |
|           | Paid Mr. Verrals for the support of William Dick for one year to the of ..  | 3 18 0   |
|           | Paid the rent of Burton and Tarboxes' houses to Lady Day last .. ..   | 1 19 0   |
|           | Paid for a church umbrella .. .. ..   | 0 14 0   |
|           | Paid for a lock for the draw in the vestry room .. .. ..  | 0 2 6    |
|           | Paid for a quarter load of bushes for the workhouse hedge.. .. ..   | 0 6 0    |
|           | Paid Mr. Verrals bills as under:—   |          |
|           | To half year's salary to Lady Day .. ..   | 4 10 0   |
|           | To six brooms 2s., three mops 3s. 6d. .. ..   | 0 5 6    |
|           | To six bushels of coals 10s., one hair broom 2s. 6d.  | 0 12 6   |
|           | To ten poor burials, viz., Cheesemore, Ing, How, Miller, Peachy, Benson, Porter, Crawley, Wadle and Boulden .. .. | 1 10 0   |
|           | To three baptisms of Wadle, Mark and Webb .. .. ..  | 0 6 0    |
|           | Paid two women for cleaning the church after the bricklayers ..   | 0 3 0    |
|           | <hr/>   | <hr/>    |
|           | Paid for two boxes of ointment .. ..  | 0 3 0    |
|           | <hr/>   | <hr/>    |
|           | 58 8 6  |          |
|           | T. H. Andrew, Esq., has disbursed by former vestrys as are entered in this book .. .. .. ..                       | 163 15 1 |
|           | <hr/>   | <hr/>    |
|           | Total disburst .. ..  | 222 3 7  |
|           | Esquire Andrew is deficient uncollected in the three rates as is particularized backward .. .. .. ..              | 22 5 0   |
|           | <hr/>   | <hr/>    |
|           | Carried forward .. ..   | £244 8 7 |

|  |      |     |    |
|--|------|-----|----|
| Brought forward .. ..                    | £244 | 8   | 7  |
| Esquire Andrews has received as under:—  |      |     |    |
| Upon arrears of John Ray                 | 1    | 2   | 9  |
| Upon arrears of Mrs. Bradbury .. ..      | 0    | 10  | 0  |
| Upon arrears of Commodore Robinson .. .. | 2    | 8   | 0  |
| Upon arrears of Mr. Steer .. ..          | 2    | 2   | 0  |
| By the first book .. ..                  | 90   | 0   | 0  |
| ,, second book .. ..                     | 90   | 8   | 0  |
| ,, third book.. ..                       | 45   | 8   | 6  |
|  |      | 231 | 19 |
| Balance due to Mr. Andrews .. ..         | 12   | 9   | 4  |

The foregoing accounts of Thomas Singleton, Esq., and T. H. Andrews, Esq., the late overseers, was examined and inspected and approved of at this present vestry and there appears a balance due to the parish—

|  |    |    |   |
|--|----|----|---|
| From Thomas Singleton, Esq., of .. ..                  | 2  | 10 | 9 |
| And to T. H. Andrew, Esq., from the parish .. .. .. .. | 12 | 9  | 4 |

(Signed)      J. GROCOCK, }  
                   J. GARRATT, } *Churchwardens.*  
                   THOMAS WILKINSON, *Overseer.*  
                   And 7 Inhabitants.

*May 27th, 1798.*

Being the usual monthly vestry and not any of the present officers attending, the entering of any accounts or disbursements was referred to a future day.

THOMAS MEAD.  
 JOHN CLARIDGE.  
 JAMES LEGG'S mark X  
 WILLIAM SMALLBOURN.

*May 28th, 1798.*

At an adjourned meeting of the Committee for the parishes of Finchley and Friern Barnet from the 19th instant held this day in the parish church of Finchley: It was agreed to enter into a subscription towards defraying the expenses of the Association, and the following gentlemen present subscribed the sums opposite to their names.

We, whose names are hereunto subscribed, do hereby promise and agree to associate and unite for the purpose of preserving tranquillity in the neighbourhood and parishes of Finchley and Friern Barnet,

and to use our utmost endeavour to protect and defend the lives and properties of the inhabitants thereof, and to subscribe the following sums:—

|                   |               |                          |                |
|-------------------|---------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| John Bacon ..     | .. £10 10 0   | Brought forward          | £29 8 0        |
| Ralph Worsley ..  | .. 1 1 0      | Sir Thomas Pasley, Bart. | 1 1 0          |
| Thomas Collins .. | .. 2 2 0      | John Pasley ..           | .. 2 2 0       |
| Samuel Hawkins .. | .. 10 10 0    | John Bickley ..          | .. 1 1 0       |
| Thomas Gildart .. | .. 2 2 0      | Thomas Lermitte ..       | .. 2 2 0       |
| T. H. Andrew ..   | .. 3 3 0      | The Rev. Mr. Lake ..     | .. 1 1 0       |
| Carried forward   | <hr/> £29 8 0 |                          | <hr/> £36 15 0 |

(COPY.)

The Churchwardens present and two of the Committee agreed to collect the parochial subscriptions and to report the same at the next meeting of the Committee. And it was agreed at the same time that the Committee do meet here again on Monday next to receive the returns of such proper persons as may give in their names for enrolment.

Further subscriptions collected by the Churchwardens, &c.:—

|                       |                |                          |               |
|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| Lawrence Lyon ..      | £1 1 0         | Brought forward          | £14 14 6      |
| Jane Jamison ..       | 1 1 0          | Mrs. Smith ..            | .. 1 1 0      |
| Richard Neate, Clk .. | 2 2 0          | H. F. Williams ..        | .. 1 1 0      |
| John Holdsworth ..    | 1 1 0          | J. Cotham ..             | .. 1 1 0      |
| Miles Fenton ..       | 1 1 0          | John Trotter ..          | .. 10 10 0    |
| Widow Nixon ..        | 0 2 6          | Mrs. Jordan, jun.        | .. 1 1 0      |
| B. Bradbury ..        | 2 2 0          | John Drury ..            | .. 2 2 0      |
| H. H. Hargrave ..     | 2 0 0          | The Rev. Mr. Jeffreys .. | 2 2 0         |
| Josiah Widnell ..     | 2 2 0          | James Smith, Esq. ..     | 5 0 0         |
| Samuel Self ..        | 1 1 0          | This subscription        | <hr/> 38 12 6 |
| Henry Gostling ..     | 1 1 0          | Total subscription       | <hr/> £75 7 6 |
| Carried forward       | <hr/> £14 14 6 |                          |               |

(COPY.)

---

At a meeting of the united parishes of Finchley and Friern Barnet, held on the 4th of June, 1798, in the parish church of Finchley.

*Resolved*—“That John Bacon, Esq., be requested to transmit to “the Lord Lieutenant of the County the resolutions of these parishes “of the 12th of May last in order to the obtaining of his Majesty’s “determination respecting their offer of service.”

---

June 24th, 1798.

At a vestry held the 24th day of June, 1798, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the County of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Thomas Godson, the present East End Overseer, be allowed the undermentioned disbursements”:

1798.

|            |   |     |    |   |
|------------|---|-----|----|---|
| May 27th.  | Paid at the vestry held that day .. ..  | £0  | 3  | 6 |
| ,, 28th.   | Turning chips, &c., for firing for the poor ..<br>house .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 4  | 0 |
| ,, 29th    | Paid Edward Marsh his wife .. .. .. ..  | 0   | 6  | 0 |
| June 4th.  | Gave John Ardif for himself and wife .. .. .. ..  | 0   | 3  | 0 |
|            | Gave the widow Hodges .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 3  | 6 |
|            | Edwd. White .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 3  | 0 |
|            | Alexr. Boulden .. .. .. ..  | 0   | 2  | 6 |
|            | Paid Edwd. Marsh his wife .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 6  | 0 |
|            | Gave John Aldy for himself and wife .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 3  | 0 |
| June 9th.  | Gave Wm. Blundell .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 2  | 0 |
|            | Gave Mary Laman .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 3  | 0 |
| ,, 11th.   | Paid Edward Marsh his wife .. .. .. ..  | 0   | 6  | 0 |
| ,, 13th.   | Gave Wm. Blundell .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 2  | 0 |
|            | For a horse and cart to take Mary Laman to<br>the poor house .. .. .. ..  | 0   | 2  | 0 |
| June 15th. | Paid for meat to the poor house .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 2  | 6 |
|            | Gave to go out of the house .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 5  | 0 |
| June 18th. | Gave Mrs. Schofield 3 weeks' pay .. .. .. ..  | 0   | 9  | 0 |
|            | Gave Mrs. Harrison for 3 weeks' do. .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 10 | 0 |
|            | Gave to a pass .. .. .. ..  | 0   | 0  | 6 |
|            | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward Marsh's wife .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 6  | 0 |
|            | Paid for necessaries and assistance for a poor<br>man for 2 days and money to go on with,<br>he being taken ill on the road .. .. .. ..       | 0   | 5  | 0 |
|            | Paid Mr. Leg for the East End pensioners,<br>and the children's nursing and schooling<br>from the last vestry to this as per bill .. .. .. .. | 14  | 11 | 0 |
|            | Paid the usual allowance of the vestry .. .. .. ..  | 0   | 3  | 6 |
|            |   | £19 | 2  | 6 |

*Ordered*—“That the following notice be inserted in the *Daily Advertiser* for letting the poor:—

“PARISH OF FINCHLEY, Middlesex.

“Notice is hereby given that there will be a vestry held at Mrs. Claridge's, the sign of the Queen's Head, near the church, in the said parish, on Wednesday, the 18th day of July next, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon, for the purpose of letting the poor of the said parish, to be maintained and clothed by the head per week for one whole year in the poor house of the said parish, and the contractor to have the benefit of their employment. To commence from any future day agreed upon, when any person or persons inclined to contract for the same may deliver in their proposals, and if approved of will be treated with.”

*Ordered*—“Likewise that notice be given in the church on Sunday “the 15th July next for the purpose of making a rate for the necessary “relief of the poor of the said parish and other allowable disbursements.”

*Ordered*—“That the following pensioners be reduced in their pension as under:—”

Widow Knowel .. 1s. per week till further orders.

Wm. Blundell .. 2s. , , ,

Widow Hetherington 1s. , , ,

Alexr. Boulden .. 1s. , , ,

Geo. Beach .. 2s. , , ,

Hugh Jordan .. 2s. , , ,

(Signed by) J. GROCOCK, *Churchwarden*,  
And 6 Inhabitants.

At a meeting of the Finchley and Friern Barnet Association, held in Finchley Church on Monday, the 9th July, 1795.

Present—

John Bacon, Esq., *Chairman*.

Samuel Hawkins, Mr. Lyon,

The Rev. R. Wordsley, Mr. Singleton,

John Pasley, Esq., Mr. Grocock, } *Churchwardens*,

T. H. Andrew, Esq., Mr. Garratt, } Finchley.

Thos. Lermitee, Esq., Mr. Bussell, Do., Friern.

The Chairman having communicated to the meeting that he had complied with the requisition of the former meeting in laying before the Lord Lieutenant the resolutions of their Association and was honoured with a letter of which the following is a copy:—

WELBECK, June 7th, 1798.

“Sir,—I am very sorry that consistently with the instructions I have received in the last circular letter on the subject of Volunteer Corps from Mr. Dundas, I cannot recommend any offer of associating for the defence of particular parishes, and I am therefore under the necessity, however unwilling I may be, to damp the spirit and loyalty of the inhabitants of Finchley and Friern Barnet of declining their offer.

“JOHN BACON, Esq.

“I shall take care to transmit to the Earl of Harrington an account of the number of teams to be furnished in case of emergency.

“I have the honour to be, Sir,

“Your most obedient servant,

“SCOTT TITCHFIELD.”

It was likewise resolved, that the different sums of money collected in aid of the Associations, as they are not wanted for that express purpose, be refunded by the treasurer and Churchwardens to the different subscribers.

(COPY.)

At a vestry held the 18th day of July, 1798, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex, pursuant to the notice given in the church on Sunday last, for the purpose of making a rate for and towards the necessary relief of the poor and other allowable disbursements, and also for the purpose of letting the poor to farm by the head per week for one year, agreeable to an advertisement for the same purpose.

*Ordered*—“That a rate of one shilling in the pound be made for “and towards the necessary relief of the poor and other allowable dis-“bursements, and a rate of one shilling in the pound was made “accordingly.”

A Mr. Penn being the only person that made any proposal for taking the poor to farm in consequence of an advertisement for the said purpose, it was agreed on at the said vestry and by the said Josh. Penn to allow him three shillings and ninepence per head per week according to number and to be conformable to such articles as shall be drawn up for to be signed and executed for the said purpose, if upon enquiry his security is approved of, and to meet at the poor house on the 30th of this month to confirm the said contract.

*Ordered*—“That the house belonging to the parish, late in the occupation of Wm. Blundell, be now granted to Francis Claridge “and his family for their residence during the pleasure of the “inhabitants in vestry assembled.”

#### MEMORANDUM.

It was unanimously agreed on between the inhabitants in this present vestry and Mr. J. Yew Griffiths for him to pay fifteen shillings a year yearly and every year so long as the enclosure before his house in Barratt's Lane that has been late enclosed of the waste shall remain so.

|          |                   |                  |
|----------|-------------------|------------------|
| (Signed) | J. GROCOCK,       | } Churchwardens. |
|          | J. GARRATT,       |                  |
|          | THOMAS WILKINSON, | } Overseers.     |
|          | THOS. MEAD,       |                  |
|          | J. T. GRIFFITHS.  |                  |

And 6 Inhabitants.

|  |     |    |       |
|--|-----|----|-------|
| The usual allowance of the vestry .. ..                    | £0  | 3  | 6     |
| Mr. Godson's 2 former vestrys, brought forward .. .. .. .. | 57  | 10 | 2     |
|  |     |    | <hr/> |
|  | £76 | 11 | 2     |

*Ordered*—“That George Beck, an inhabitant of the said parish, be permitted at his earnest request to go into the boarded erection (lately purchased at the parish expense of the widow Temple) to reside therein during the option of the inhabitants in vestry assembled, he paying one shilling per week by agreement (with the

" officers and inhabitants assembled this day in vestry) during the  
" time of his residence therein."

The mark of  
  
GEORGE BECK.

*Ordered*—“ That the parish pays one quarter's rent for Francis Claridge, and that in consideration of his being permitted to reside in the house late occupied by Wm. Blundell his weekly allowance of 2s. 6d. per week be discontinued.”

(Signed)      J. GROCOCK, }  
                  J. GARRATT, } *Churchwardens.*

Autographs of 7 Ratepayers.

At a vestry held the 22nd day of September, 1798, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex, pursuant to notice given in the church on Sunday last, for the purpose of nominating proper persons to serve the office of surveyor of the highways within the said parish for the year ensuing, according to an Act of Parliament for the same purpose.

We whose names are hereunto subscribed in vestry assembled do nominate the following inhabitants whose names are hereunder written as persons qualified to serve the above office for the said parish for the year ensuing:—

EAST END.

John Claridge.  
John Grocock.  
James Tomlinson.  
Thomas Verralls.  
Thomas Singleton.

NORTH END.

John Crockford.  
James Spencer.  
John Hunt.  
John Wager.  
Willm. Smallbourn.

(Signed)      J. GROCOCK, *Churchwarden,*  
                  and

THOS. WILKINSON, *Overseer of the Poor.*  
And 6 Inhabitants.

Mr. Pott, an inhabitant of this parish, hath this day made an application to the churchwardens and inhabitants in vestry assembled for to be allotted a pew in the church.

MEMORANDUM.

Likewise at this vestry the before-mentioned sum of thirty-eight pounds twelve shillings and sixpence that was collected by the churchwardens of the parishes of Finchley and Friern Barnett and Mr. Thomas Singleton from the several subscribers and deposited in Finchley Parish Chest, was on this day taken out of the said chest and delivered to Mr. Thomas Singleton, who undertook to refund the same to the different subscribers according to the order of the last

Association meeting, held in the parish church of Finchley on the ninth day of July last.

Present at the delivery,

Mr. JOHN GROCOCK, } Churchwardens.  
Mr. JOHN GARRATT, }  
Mr. THOS. MEAD, *Deputy Overseer.*  
WM. SMALLBOURN, *Vestry Clerk.*  
Mrs. CLARIDGE, &c., &c.

At a vestry held the 30th day of September, 1798, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Thomas Godson, the present East-end Overseer, be allowed the undermentioned bills and disbursements.”

1798.

|              |   |        |
|--------------|---|--------|
| August 27th. | Paid Mr. Payne for Edward Marsh, one week, a substitute .. .. ..        | £0 6 0 |
|              | Gave a poor man that fell off Mr. Andrew's hay rick to go home .. .. .. | 0 2 0  |
|              | Relieved four passes .. .. ..   | 0 0 8  |
|              | Relieved a soldier, his wife, and four children .. .. ..                | 0 1 0  |
|              | Gave Elizabeth Tyler .. .. ..   | 0 2 6  |
| ,, 29th.     | Paid Mr. Bridgman, the high constable, the County Levy Money Bill .. .. | 21 1 5 |
|              | Gave a woman and two children .. .. ..                                  | 0 0 6  |

At a vestry held the 29th of July, 1798, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the County of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Thomas Godson, the present East End Overseer, be allowed the undermentioned disbursements.”

1798.

|            |  |         |
|------------|--|---------|
| June 25th. | Paid Mrs. Payne for Mrs. Marsh .. ..   | £0 6 0  |
| July 2nd.  | Paid Mrs. Payne for Mrs. Marsh .. ..   | 0 6 0   |
| ,, 3rd.    | To a cart and horse and man and other expenses conveying a poor man to the hospital .. .. .. | 0 7 6   |
|            | Paid for ditto at the hospital .. .. ..  | 0 2 0   |
|            | To a sack of turning chips to the poor house .. .. ..  | 0 0 6   |
|            | Gave to passes .. .. ..  | 0 0 6   |
|            | Gave a man belonging to the parish .. .. ..  | 0 1 6   |
| ,, 7th.    | Paid for 12lbs. of bacon to the poor house .. .. ..  | 0 6 0   |
|            | To a horse and cart to convey a poor man to the poor house .. .. ..                          | 0 1 0   |
| ,, 9th.    | Paid Mrs. Payne for Mrs. Marsh .. ..   | 0 6 0   |
|            | Paid Mrs. Schofield for three weeks pay .. .. ..   | 0 9 0   |
|            | Paid Mrs. Harris for three weeks pay .. .. ..  | 0 10 6  |
|            | Gave a poor man at the poor house .. .. ..   | 0 1 6   |
|            | Carried forward .. .. ..   | £2 18 0 |

|   |  |         |
|---|--|---------|
|   | Brought forward .. .. ..   | £2 18 0 |
| July 9th.                                     | Paid for a quarter of a hundred of faggots<br>for the house .. .. ..                                       | 0 6 0   |
|   | Paid for advertising the poor to be let three<br>times .. .. ..  | 0 15 0  |
| ,, 16th.                                      | Paid Mrs. Payne for Mrs. Marsh .. ..   | 0 6 0   |
|   | Relieved a pass .. .. ..   | 0 0 6   |
|   | Relieved a pass .. .. ..   | 0 0 2   |
|   | Relieved a pass 6d., relieved a pass 9d. ..  | 0 1 3   |
| ,, 18th.                                      | Paid at the vestry making a rate and letting<br>the poor .. .. ..  | 2 2 0   |
|   | Bacon to the workhouse .. .. ..  | 0 2 3   |
|   | Paid Mr. Herridge for shop goods for the<br>poor house as per bill .. ..                                   | 3 12 3  |
| July 23rd.                                    | Paid Mrs. Payne for Mrs. Marsh .. ..   | 0 6 0   |
| ,, 26th.                                      | Relieved passes .. .. ..   | 0 0 8   |
| ,, 28th.                                      | Paid expenses going to the coroner and the<br>jury setting on the poor man found on<br>the common .. .. .. | 1 14 0  |
| ,, 29th.                                      | Paid Mary Bateman for ten weeks for her<br>child, James White, to the 1st<br>August next .. .. ..          | 1 5 0   |
|   | Paid Mrs. Perkins for 34 quarts of milk for<br>the poor house .. .. ..                                     | 0 7 1   |
|   | Paid Mr. Leg for shop goods and clothing<br>for the poor in the house as per bill ..                       | 6 1 0   |
|   | Paid Mr. Leg for the pensioners as per<br>account for five weeks to this day ..                            | 18 7 0  |
|   | The usual allowance of the vestry .. ..  | 0 3 6   |
| Mr. Godson's first vestry brought on .. .. .. | 38 7 8   |         |
|   | 19 2 6   |         |
|   | <u>£57 10 2</u>  |         |

(Signed)      J. GROCOCK, *Churchwarden.*  
And 6 Inhabitants.

August 26th, 1798.

At a vestry held the 26th day of August, 1798, in and for the  
parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex—

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Thomas Godson, the present East End Over-  
“seer, be allowed the undermentioned bills and disbursements” :—

1798.

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Paid Mr. Perkins for milk for the work-<br>house .. .. .. | £0 0 11 |
| Relieved a pass .. .. ..                                  | 0 0 10  |
| Carried forward .. .. ..                                  | £0 1 9  |

|             |   |     |    |    |
|-------------|---|-----|----|----|
|             | Brought forward .. .. ..  | £0  | 1  | 9  |
| July 30th.  | Paid Mrs. Pain for Edwd. Marsh's family ..  | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|             | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0   | 0  | 3  |
| August 6th. | Paid Mrs. Pain for Edward Marsh's family ..   | 0   | 6  | 0  |
| ,, 13th.    | Paid ditto for ditto .. .. ..   | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|             | Relieved a poor man .. .. ..  | 0   | 0  | 6  |
|             | Paid the widow Schofield for 5 weeks' pension ..  | 0   | 15 | 0  |
|             | Paid Mrs. Harris for 5 weeks' pension ..  | 0   | 17 | 6  |
|             | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0   | 0  | 4  |
|             | Relieved three passes .. .. ..  | 0   | 1  | 0  |
| ,, 20th.    | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edwd. Marsh's family ..   | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|             | Relieved a soldier's wife and 3 children ..   | 0   | 0  | 9  |
|             | Paid for 1 doz. of bowls, 1 doz. of spoons,<br>and 1 doz. of trenchers for the poor house ..                    | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|             | Gave to Wm. Wallace, by order of vestry,<br>being very ill .. .. ..   | 0   | 5  | 0  |
|             | Paid the East End Pensioners for one month's<br>pension to this day, as per bill, etc. ...                      | 10  | 14 | 6  |
|             | Paid Mr. Bean for bread for the house, as<br>per bill .. .. ..  | 4   | 0  | 9  |
|             | Paid Mr. Franklin, as deducted from Mr.<br>Screa's account paid for him at Highgate<br>Court .. .. ..           | 0   | 10 | 2  |
| Sept. 3rd.  | Paid Mrs. Payne, for Edward Marsh, one<br>week .. .. ..   | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|             | Paid for stamps for the agreement between<br>the parish and Mr. Penn .. .. ..                                   | 2   | 2  | 0  |
|             | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0   | 0  | 4  |
| ,, 10th.    | Paid Mrs. Payne, for Edward Marsh ..  | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|             | Paid for one dozen of bowls, one dozen of<br>trenchers, one dozen of spoons, and one<br>large spoon .. .. ..    | 0   | 6  | 6  |
|             | Gave John Staines' wife, in the almshouses ..   | 0   | 2  | 0  |
| ,, 17th.    | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward Marsh ..   | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|             | Gave a poor sailor .. .. ..   | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|             | Gave John Staines' wife .. .. ..  | 0   | 2  | 0  |
|             | Gave a poor man with a pass .. .. ..  | 0   | 0  | 4  |
| ,, 24th.    | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward Marsh ..   | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|             | Paid Mrs. Schofield for six weeks for her<br>dumb boy .. .. ..  | 0   | 18 | 0  |
|             | Paid Mrs. Harris for six weeks for Elizabeth<br>King .. .. ..   | 1   | 1  | 0  |
|             | Paid Mrs. Ing for milk for the house to the<br>3 <sup>th</sup> of July .. .. ..                                 | 0   | 3  | 1½ |
|             | Paid Mr. Sanders for two loaves of bread<br>for the workhouse the day before it was<br>let to Mr. Penn .. .. .. | 0   | 2  | 10 |
|             | John Staines' wife .. .. ..   | 0   | 2  | 0  |
|             | Carried forward .. .. ..  | £25 | 7  | 7½ |

|             |   |      |    |     |
|-------------|---|------|----|-----|
|             | Brought forward .. ..   | £25  | 7  | 7½  |
| Sept. 24th. | Paid Mr. Legg for the East End Pensioners,<br>as per bill and list .. ..  | 11   | 0  | 0   |
|             | Paid Ann Mark for her child for twenty-<br>one weeks, at 2s. 6d. per week, from<br>the 7th of May to the 23rd inst. ..  | 2    | 12 | 6   |
|             | Paid the usual allowance of the vestry ..   | 0    | 3  | 6   |
|             | Paid Mr. Legg for shop goods for the work-<br>house before Mr. Penn commenced ..  | 0    | 7  | 3½  |
|             |   | 42   | 1  | 11½ |
|             | Mr. Godson's three former vestrys brought<br>on.. .. .. ..  | 76   | 11 | 2   |
|             | Paid Mr. Penn for four weeks for his care<br>and maintenance of the poor, from the<br>30th July to the 27th of August, as per<br>bill at 3s. 9d. per head, according to his<br>contract .. .. .. .. | 14   | 5  | 0   |
|             | Total .. ..   | £132 | 18 | 1½  |

(Signed) J. GROCOCK, } Churchwardens.

J. GARRATT, }  
THOS. WILKINSON, Overseer.

And 6 Inhabitants.

At a vestry held the 28th day of October, 1798, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

Ordered—"That Mr. Thomas Wilkinson, the present North End Overseer, be allowed the undermentioned bills and disbursements, "none of his disbursements having been entered in this book before."

1798.

|        |  |    |    |   |
|--------|--|----|----|---|
| May    | Paid for the warrant of appointment .. ..                    | £0 | 8  | 0 |
|        | Paid the weekly pensioners as under :-                       |    |    |   |
| " 11th | The widow Clark .. .. .. 0 1 6                               |    |    |   |
|        | The widow Hart .. .. .. 0 10 6                               |    |    |   |
|        | Eliz. Griffith's child .. .. .. 0 2 6                        |    |    |   |
|        | The boy left at F. Payne's .. .. .. 0 2 6                    |    |    |   |
|        | Robt. Ray's child .. .. .. 0 1 6                             |    |    |   |
|        | George Beach .. .. .. 0 6 0                                  |    |    |   |
|        | George Beach's lodging .. .. .. 0 2 0                        |    |    |   |
|        | Mrs. Wall for Jo. Helsdon's three<br>children .. .. .. 0 9 0 |    |    |   |
|        | Hugh Jordan's family .. .. .. 0 7 0                          |    |    |   |
|        | Thos. Beach .. .. .. 0 4 0                                   |    |    |   |
|        |  | 2  | 6  | 6 |
|        | Carried forward .. ..  | £2 | 14 | 6 |

|                 | Brought forward .. .. ..  | £2 14 6  |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| May 13th.       | Relieved two passes .. .. ..  | 0 0 8    |
| ,, 18th.        | Paid the weekly pensioners as above .. .. ..  | 2 6 6    |
|                 | Relieved a pass 3d., relieved a pass 4d., relieved a pass 3d. .. .. ..                                      | 0 0 10   |
| ,, 24th.        | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0 0 6    |
| ,, 25th.        | Relieved a pass 9d. .. .. ..  | 0 0 9    |
| ,, 26th.        | Paid the weekly pensioners as before .. .. ..   | 2 6 6    |
| ,, 27th.        | Relieved a pass 6d., 28th relieved a pass 4d. .. .. ..  | 0 0 10   |
| June 1st.       | Relieved a pass 3d., relieved a pass 4d .. .. ..  | 0 0 7    |
| ,, 2nd.         | Relieved two passes .. .. ..  | 0 0 7    |
|                 | Paid the weekly pensioners as before .. .. ..   | 2 6 6    |
|                 | Relieved George Beach extra .. .. ..  | 0 2 0    |
|                 | Relieved Thomas Beach extra .. .. ..  | 0 4 0    |
| ,, 7th.         | Relieved a pass 6d., the 8th relieved a pass 1s. .. .. ..   | 0 1 6    |
| ,, 8th.         | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0 0 6    |
| ,, 9th.         | Paid the weekly pensioners as before .. .. ..   | 2 6 6    |
| ,, 11th.        | Relieved a pass 4d.; relieved a pass 6d. .. .. ..   | 0 0 10   |
| ,, 12th.        | Relieved a pass 6d., 13th relieved a pass 6d., another 4d. .. .. ..   | 0 1 4    |
| ,, 15th.        | Relieved a pass 4d. .. .. ..  | 0 0 4    |
| ,, 16th.        | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..   | 2 4 6    |
| ,, 17th.        | Relieved two passes .. .. ..  | 0 0 10   |
| ,, 20th.        | Relieved Mary Guest .. .. ..  | 0 12 0   |
|                 | Relieved Phebe Banks .. .. ..   | 0 12 0   |
| ,, 20th & 22nd. | Relieved three passes .. .. ..  | 0 1 4    |
| ,, 23rd.        | Paid the weekly pensioners as per last week .. .. ..  | 2 4 6    |
| ,, 26th.        | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0 1 0    |
| ,, 30th.        | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..   | 1 18 6   |
|                 | Relieved two passes .. .. ..  | 0 1 0    |
| July 5th.       | Relieved Thos. Beach's Widow .. .. ..   | 0 3 0    |
| ,, 6th.         | Relieved a pass 6d., the 7th relieved two passes 10d. .. .. ..  | 0 1 4    |
| ,, 7th.         | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..   | 2 1 6    |
| ,, 9th.         | Relieved two passes .. .. ..  | 0 0 10   |
| ,, 11th.        | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0 0 4    |
| ,, 14th.        | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..   | 2 1 6    |
| ,, 15th.        | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0 0 6    |
| ,, 18th.        | Paid Phebe Banks 12s., Mary Guest 12s. .. .. ..   | 1 4 0    |
| ,, 19th.        | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0 1 0    |
| ,, 20th.        | Relieved three passes .. .. ..  | 0 1 6    |
| ,, 21st.        | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..   | 2 1 6    |
| ,, 25th.        | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0 0 6    |
| ,, 28th.        | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..   | 2 1 6    |
| ,, 29th.        | Relieved two passes .. .. ..  | 0 1 0    |
| ,, 30th.        | Expenses attending the removing the wooden cow-house that the parish purchased of the Widow Temple .. .. .. | 1 0 0    |
|                 | Carried forward .. .. ..  | £31 11 5 |

|                 | Brought forward  | .. | .. | .. | £31 | 11 | 5               |
|-----------------|--|----|----|----|-----|----|-----------------|
| Aug. 1st.       | Relieved a pass  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 6               |
| ,, 4th.         | Paid the weekly pensioners   | .. | .. | .. | 2   | 1  | 6               |
| ,, 5th & 9th.   | Relieved three passes  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 1  | 4               |
| ,, 11th.        | Paid the weekly pensioners   | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 10 | 0               |
| ,, 15th.        | Paid Mary Guest 12s., and Phebe Banks 12s.   | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 4  | 0               |
| ,, 17th.        | Relieved three passes  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 1  | 0               |
| ,, 18th.        | Paid the weekly pensioners   | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 10 | 0               |
| ,, 19th.        | Relieved a pass  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 4               |
| ,, 25th.        | Paid the weekly pensioners   | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 10 | 0               |
| ,, 26th.        | Paid Mrs. Wall for Josh. Hilsdon's three children  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 9  | 0               |
|                 | Paid Mr. Grocock for Miles Fitzwater   | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 8  | 0               |
|                 | Paid Mr. Screas for his expenses as constable  | .. | .. | .. | 4   | 8  | 2               |
| ,, 30th.        | Relieved a pass  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 1  | 0               |
| Sept. 1st.      | Paid the weekly pensioners   | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 10 | 6               |
| ,, 4th.         | Relieved two passes  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 10              |
| ,, 8th.         | Paid the weekly pensioners   | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 10 | 6               |
| ,, 12th.        | Paid Mary Guest 12s. and Phebe Banks 12s.  | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 4  | 0               |
| ,, 12th & 13th. | Relieved four passes   | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 2  | 0               |
| ,, 15th.        | Paid the weekly pensioners   | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 10 | 0               |
| ,, 17th.        | Relieved two passes  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 1  | 0               |
| ,, 18th & 21st. | Relieved three passes  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 1  | 2               |
| ,, 22nd.        | Paid the weekly pensioners   | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 10 | 0               |
| ,, 24th.        | Paid Mr. Taylor his bill for his yearly salary for medicines and attendance on the poor and for deliveries to Midsummer last as per bill | .. | .. | .. | 15  | 3  | 0               |
| ,, 25th.        | Paid for a letter 2d., relieved two passes 8d.   | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 10              |
| ,, 26th.        | Paid Mary Guest 6s. and Phebe Banks 6s...  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 12 | 0               |
| ,, 29th.        | Paid the weekly pensioners   | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 10 | 0               |
|                 | Paid Mrs. Wall for Josh. Hilsdon's children for clothing   | .. | .. | .. | 2   | 11 | 0 $\frac{3}{4}$ |
|                 | Paid for George Beach  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 18 | 8               |
| Oct. 1st.       | Paid Mrs. Payne for eight weeks for the boy left upon her at 2s. 6d. per week  | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 0  | 0               |
|                 | Paid Richard Wall for five weeks for Jos. Hilsdon's child at 3s. per week  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 15 | 0               |
| ,, 2nd.         | Relieved a pass  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 6               |
|                 | Relieved George Beach 2s. 6d., relieved for gin 1s.  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 3  | 6               |
| ,, 4th & 6th.   | Relieved four passes   | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 1  | 10              |
| ,, 6th.         | Paid the weekly pensioners   | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 15 | 6               |
| ,, 7th.         | Relieved a woman   | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 1  | 2               |
| ,, 9th.         | Relieved a pass  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 6               |
| ,, 10th.        | Paid Mary Guest 6s., and Phebe Banks   | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 12 | 0               |
| ,, 11th.        | Relieved a pass  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 4               |
|                 | Expenses, &c., taking Sarah Page, Mrs. Jones's apprentice, to Bow Street   | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 13 | 6               |

Carried forward .. .. £79 5 7 $\frac{3}{4}$

|            |   |     |    |            |
|------------|---|-----|----|------------|
|            | Brought forward .. ..                       | £79 | 5  | 7 <i>½</i> |
| Oct. 12th. | Relieved a pass .. ..                       | 0   | 0  | 6          |
|            | Paid the weekly pensioners .. ..            | 1   | 15 | 6          |
| ,, 18th.   | Paid for a letter from Took's Court .. ..   | 0   | 0  | 2          |
|            | Relieved a pass .. ..                       | 0   | 0  | 6          |
| ,, 20th.   | Paid the weekly pensioners .. ..            | 1   | 15 | 6          |
| ,, 23rd.   | Relieved a pass .. ..                       | 0   | 0  | 4          |
| ,, 24th.   | Paid Mary Guest 6s. and Phebe Banks 6s.. .. | 0   | 12 | 0          |
| ,, 27th.   | Paid the weekly pensioners .. ..            | 1   | 15 | 6          |
|            | Total .. .. .. ..                           | £85 | 5  | 7 <i>½</i> |

At the same vestry the bills and disbursements that have been disbursed by Mr. Thomas Godson, the present East End Overseer, be entered and allowed.

1798.

|           |   |     |    |    |
|-----------|---|-----|----|----|
| Oct. 1st. | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward March's family ..  | £0  | 6  | 0  |
|           | Relieved a pass .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 0  | 8  |
|           | Paid Mr. Penn for five weeks for his care<br>and maintenance of the poor according<br>to contract .. .. .. ..     | 19  | 13 | 4  |
| ,, 5th.   | Relieved a pass .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 0  | 4  |
|           | Expenses, and horse and cart going to town<br>to buy clothing and sheeting, &c., for<br>the house .. .. .. ..     | 0   | 10 | 0  |
| ,, 8th.   | Paid Mary Bateman for nine weeks' pay<br>for her son James White, at 2s. 6d. per<br>week .. .. .. ..              | 1   | 2  | 6  |
|           | Relieved a pass .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 0  | 6  |
|           | Paid Mr. Payne for Edward Marsh's family ..   | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|           | Relieved a pass 4d., relieved a woman and<br>child 6d. .. .. .. ..  | 0   | 0  | 10 |
|           | Gave John Brown .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 1  | 0  |
| ,, 15th.  | Paid Mrs. Payne for Marsh's family ..   | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|           | Gave a poor soldier .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 0  | 4  |
|           | Paid Mr. Audsley for shoes for the house,<br>per bill .. .. .. ..   | 2   | 11 | 6  |
| ,, 22nd.  | Paid Mrs. Payne for Marsh's family ..   | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|           | Gave a poor woman and child at East-end ..  | 0   | 1  | 0  |
|           | Paid Mr. Leg for the East-end pensions<br>from the last vestry to this, as per<br>accounts .. .. .. ..            | 9   | 6  | 0  |
| ,, 15th.  | Paid Messrs. Barton and Marsh, of Grace-<br>church-street, for stockings for the poor,<br>as per bill .. .. .. .. | 1   | 5  | 6  |
|           | Paid Mr. Beard, linen draper, for shirts,<br>shifts, sheets, &c., for the poor in the<br>house .. .. .. ..        | 6   | 3  | 7  |
|           | Carried forward .. .. .. ..   | £42 | 1  | 1  |

|            |  |      |    |                 |
|------------|--|------|----|-----------------|
|            | Brought forward .. .. ..   | £42  | 1  | 1               |
| Oct. 15th. | Paid Mr. Transon for shoes for the children<br>in the house, as per bill .. .. ..  | 0    | 18 | 0               |
|            | Paid for three handkerchiefs for the women<br>in the house .. .. ..  | 0    | 4  | 6               |
|            | Paid William Dollar, by order of this vestry,<br>as an encouragement of a singular in-<br>stance of his providing a single man<br>for a substitute for himself, he being<br>drawn to serve in the militia .. .. .. | 1    | 1  | 0               |
|            | Paid the usual allowance of the vestry .. .. ..  | 0    | 3  | 6               |
|            |  | 44   | 8  | 1               |
|            | Mr. Godson's four former vestrys, brought<br>forward .. .. .. ..   | 132  | 18 | 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ |
|            |  | £177 | 6  | 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ |

(Signed)

J. GROCOCK, *Churchwarden.*T. WILKINSON, *Overseer.*

And 5 Inhabitants.

At a Vestry held the 21st day of November, 1798, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the County of Middlesex.

Pursuant to notice given in the Church on Sunday last for the purpose of making a rate for and towards the necessary relief of the poor and other allowable disbursements.

*Ordered*—“That a rate of 1s. in the pound be made for the afore-  
“ said purpose, and a rate at 1s. in the pound was made accordingly.”

(Signed)

J. GROCOCK, *Churchwarden.*T. WILKINSON, *Overseer.*

And 9 Inhabitants.

At a vestry held the 25th day of November, 1798, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the County of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Thomas Godson, the present East End  
“ Overseer, be allowed the undermentioned Bills and Disbursements.”

1798.

|            |   |    |    |   |
|------------|---|----|----|---|
| Oct. 29th. | Paid for one week's pay to Mrs. Payne for<br>Edward Marsh's family, he being a<br>substitute in the Militia for a servant<br>of Esquire Hamerton .. .. .. | £0 | 6  | 0 |
|            | Paid Mrs. Scofield for five weeks' pension<br>for her dumb child .. .. ..   | 0  | 15 | 0 |
|            | Carried forward .. .. ..  | £1 | 1  | 0 |

|            | Brought forward..  | .. | .. | £1 | 1   | 0  |
|------------|--|----|----|----|-----|----|
| Oct. 29th. | Paid Mrs. Harris for five weeks for Eliza King .. .. .. ..   | 0  | 17 | 6  |     |    |
|            | Gave to a pass .. .. .. ..   | 0  | 0  | 8  |     |    |
|            | Gave Turpin's wife .. .. .. ..   | 0  | 1  | 0  |     |    |
|            | Gave a pass .. .. .. ..  | 0  | 0  | 4  |     |    |
| Nov. 5th.  | Paid Mrs. Payne for one week for Edward Marsh .. .. .. ..  | 0  | 6  | 0  |     |    |
|            | Paid Mr. Jaeques for meat, as per bill, for the poor-house to the 28th July last ..  | 13 | 1  | 10 |     |    |
|            | Gave a pass .. .. .. ..  | 0  | 0  | 3  |     |    |
|            | Paid Mr. Edward Claridge for beer for Blundell and Eliza White.. .. .. ..  | 0  | 3  | 0  |     |    |
|            | Gave a pass .. .. .. ..  | 0  | 0  | 3  |     |    |
| Nov. 12th. | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward Marsh's family  | 0  | 6  | 0  |     |    |
|            | Paid Mr. Thomas for Bonner's pension, from the 20th June to the 7th November last .. .. .. ..  | 4  | 4  | 0  |     |    |
|            | Gave a poor woman .. .. .. ..  | 0  | 0  | 4  |     |    |
| ,, 19th.   | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward Marsh .. .. .. ..   | 0  | 6  | 0  |     |    |
| ,, 21st.   | Gave a pass .. .. .. ..  | 0  | 0  | 3  |     |    |
|            | Paid expenses at a vestry making the poor rate .. .. .. ..   | 1  | 1  | 0  |     |    |
|            | Gave a pass .. .. .. ..  | 0  | 0  | 6  |     |    |
|            | Gave Mr. Robinson for two pair of high shoes for two boys upon the first commencement of Mr. Penn .. .. .. ..  | 0  | 10 | 0  |     |    |
|            | Paid Mr. Pierce, by Mr. Groeock, eight pounds two shillings for the family of Plumber from the 29th April to the 4th November instant, being twenty-seven weeks at 6s. per week, as per receipt .. | 8  | 2  | 0  |     |    |
|            | Paid Mr. Verrals for money that he has paid to pensioners and sundries, as per bill, from 2nd of April to the 28th of May  | 10 | 17 | 10 |     |    |
|            | Paid Mr. Verrals, as per bill, for shop goods and other necessaries for the house from the 30th of April to the 28th of May ..   | 6  | 14 | 11 |     |    |
|            | Paid Mr. Verrals for half a year's salary, due at Michaelmas last, and sundry artieles, as per bill .. .. .. ..  | 4  | 19 | 10 |     |    |
|            | Paid Mr. Verrals for half a year's rent for the poor house due at Midsummer last.. .. .. ..  | 5  | 0  | 0  |     |    |
|            | Paid Mr. Verrals for half a year's rent for Burton and Tarboxes' houses to Michaelmas last ..  | 3  | 18 | 0  |     |    |
|            | Carried forward .. ..  | £8 | 18 | 0  | £52 | 14 |
|            |  |    |    |    |     | 6  |

|            |   |                        |          |
|------------|---|------------------------|----------|
|            | Brought forward .. ..   | £8 18 0                | £52 14 6 |
| Nov. 21st. | Paid Mr. Verrals for half a year's rent for Francis Claridge's house to Christmas last ..                                   | 1 6 0                  |          |
|            | Paid Mr. Verrals for the Rev. Mr. Worsley for a year's rent for the addition to the churchyard, due at Midsummer last .. .. | 2 2 0                  |          |
|            | Paid Mr. Verrals for moving the boarded house .. ..   | 0 12 0                 |          |
|            |   | 12 18 0                |          |
|            | Paid the usual allowance of the Vestry ..   | 0 3 6                  |          |
|            |   | 65 16 0                |          |
|            | 'Mr. Godson's five former vestries broughton  | 177 6 2 $\frac{3}{4}$  |          |
|            |   | £243 2 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ |          |

(Signed)

J. GROCOCK, *Churchwarden.*T. WILKINSON, *Overseer of the Poor.*

And 6 Inhabitants.

At a Vestry held the 30th day of December, 1798, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Thomas Wilkinson, the present North End “Overseer, be allowed the undermentioned bills and disbursements” :—

1798.

|            |   |          |
|------------|---|----------|
| Oct. 29th. | Paid Miles Fitzwater for eight weeks' pension from the 6th of August to the 8th of October, at 3s. 6d. per week .. ..         | £1 8 0   |
| Nov. 1st.  | Paid Mr. Penn for one month for his care and maintenance of the poor, as per account Relieved a woman and four children .. .. | 16 6 3   |
| ,, 3rd.    | Paid the weekly provisions .. ..  | 0 1 0    |
| ,, 7th.    | Relieved a pass 6d.; 6th, Relieved a ditto 6d.  | 1 10 0   |
| ,, 8th.    | Paid Phebe Banks for two weeks .. ..  | 0 6 0    |
| ,, 10th.   | Paid Mary Guest for two weeks .. ..   | 0 6 0    |
| ,, 12th.   | Relieved a pass .. .. ..  | 0 0 4    |
| ,, 17th.   | Relieved a ditto .. .. ..   | 0 0 4    |
| ,, 19th.   | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..   | 1 10 0   |
| ,, 21st.   | Relieved a pass 4d. .. .. ..  | 0 0 4    |
|            | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..   | 0 0 10   |
|            | Relieved two passes 6d.; Relieved a ditto 4d.   | 0 0 10   |
|            | Relieved two passes 6d.; Relieved a ditto 4d.   | 0 0 10   |
|            | Paid Phebe Banks .. .. .. ..  | 0 6 0    |
|            | Carried forward .. .. .. ..   | £23 6 11 |

|   |  |                        |           |                 |          |
|---|--|------------------------|-----------|-----------------|----------|
|   |  | Brought forward .. . . | £23       | 6               | 11       |
| Nov. 21st.                                      | Relieved a poor man and woman .. . .   | 0                      | 1         | 0               |          |
|   | Relieved a pass .. . .   | 0                      | 0         | 6               |          |
|   | Paid Mary Guest for another child lately born, for one month, at 18d. per week ..  | 0                      | 6         | 0               |          |
| ,, 24th.  | Paid the weekly pensioners .. . .  | 1                      | 10        | 0               |          |
| ,, 26th.  | Relieved two passes .. . .   | 0                      | 1         | 0               |          |
|   | Gave James Green, by order of Esq. Collins Paid Mr. Jones, for lodging and necessaries for a man that did work for Mrs. War- drop, being ill and unable to work .. | 0                      | 1         | 0               |          |
|   | Paid Miles Fitzwater for eight weeks' pen- sion to 26th of November, at 3s. 6d. per week ..  | 0                      | 8         | 0               |          |
| ,, 27th.  | Relieved a pass 6d.; 29th, Relieved a ditto 6d.  | 1                      | 8         | 0               |          |
| Dec. 1st.                                       | Paid the weekly pensioners .. . .  | 0                      | 1         | 0               |          |
| ,, 2nd.   | Relieved a pass .. . .   | 1                      | 10        | 0               |          |
|   | Relieved George Beach .. . .   | 0                      | 0         | 4               |          |
| ,, 4th.   | Relieved a pass .. . .   | 0                      | 2         | 0               |          |
| ,, 5th.   | Paid Mary Guest for herself and two children for two weeks .. . .  | 0                      | 0         | 6               |          |
|   | Relieved a pass .. . .   | 0                      | 9         | 0               |          |
|   | Paid Phebe Banks for two weeks .. . .  | 0                      | 0         | 6               |          |
| ,, 8th.   | Paid the weekly pensioners .. . .  | 1                      | 10        | 0               |          |
|   | Relieved a pass .. . .   | 0                      | 0         | 6               |          |
|   | Paid Mr. Harding for shaving the poor in the house .. . .  | 0                      | 7         | 2               |          |
|   | Relieved George Beach .. . .   | 0                      | 2         | 0               |          |
| ,, 10th.  | Paid Miles Fitzwater for two weeks' pension  | 0                      | 7         | 0               |          |
| ,, 12th.  | Relieved a pass 6d.; 14th, Relieved two passes .. . .  | 0                      | 1         | 6               |          |
| ,, 15th.  | Paid for a letter .. . .   | 0                      | 0         | 2               |          |
|   | Paid the weekly pensioners .. . .  | 1                      | 10        | 0               |          |
| ,, 17th.  | Relieved Geo. Beach .. . .   | 0                      | 2         | 0               |          |
| ,, 19th.  | Relieved a pass .. . .   | 0                      | 0         | 6               |          |
|   | Paid Mary Guest .. . .   | 0                      | 9         | 0               |          |
|   | Paid Phebe Banks .. . .  | 0                      | 6         | 0               |          |
|   | Expenses going to the Sessions House .. . .  | 0                      | 3         | 0               |          |
| ,, 21st.  | Relieved a pass 6d.; Relieved a ditto 6d. . .  | 0                      | 1         | 0               |          |
| ,, 22nd.  | Paid the weekly pensioners .. . .  | 1                      | 10        | 0               |          |
|   | Relieved George Beach .. . .   | 0                      | 2         | 0               |          |
| ,, 24th.  | Relieved a pass 4d.; 26th, Relieved a ditto 6d.  | 0                      | 0         | 10              |          |
| ,, 29th.  | Paid the weekly pensioners .. . .  | 1                      | 10        | 0               |          |
|   | Relieved Geo. Beach .. . .   | 0                      | 2         | 0               |          |
|   | Paid the usual allowance of the Vestry ..  | 0                      | 3         | 6               |          |
|   |  | 38                     | 6         | 9               |          |
| <b>Mr. Wilkinson's former vestry brought on</b> |  |                        | <b>85</b> | <b>5</b>        | <b>7</b> |
|   |  | £123                   | 12        | 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ |          |

*Ordered*—“That Hugh Jordan be allowed two shillings per week “in addition to his present pension till further orders.”

(Signed)      J. GROCOCK.  
T. WILKINSON.  
And 6 Inhabitants.

January 27th, 1799.

At a vestry held on the 27th day of January, 1799, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the County of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Thomas Godson, the present East End Overseer, be allowed the undermentioned bills and disbursements”—

1798.

|            |  |
|------------|--|
|            | Paid Mr. Leg money that he has paid to the<br>East End pensioners from the 22nd of<br>October to the 29th of November last as<br>per bill .. .. .. .. .. .. £9 6 0 |
|            | Gave John Aedy's wife, by order of the<br>vestry .. .. .. .. .. .. 0 5 0   |
| Nov. 26th. | Mr. Penn for four weeks for his care and<br>maintenance of the poor, due the 26th<br>of November last, as per receipt .. 16 10 0                                   |
|            | Paid Mrs. Payne for William Marsh's family 0 6 0   |
|            | Gave a pass .. .. .. .. .. 0 0 4   |
|            | Gave old Turpin .. .. .. .. .. 0 1 0   |
|            | Paid Alice Schofield for four weeks for her<br>child from the 29th of October to the<br>26th of November .. .. .. .. .. 0 12 0                                     |
|            | Paid the Widow Harrison for four weeks<br>for Ann King for the same time at 3s. 6d.<br>per week .. .. .. .. .. 0 14 0  |
| Dec. 3rd.  | Paid Mrs. Payne for William Marsh's family 0 6 0   |
|            | Gave a woman and child .. .. .. .. .. 0 0 6  |
|            | Expenses going to Hendon about Thomas<br>Sidley's family allowance .. .. .. .. .. 0 3 6  |
| ,, 5th.    | Paid Mr. Burchal for the family of Edward<br>Keen and James Stanley, at St. Michael's,<br>Coventry, as by receipt .. .. .. .. .. 11 14 0                           |
|            | Journey to town to pay the same .. .. .. .. .. 0 2 6   |
|            | Gave James Murray .. .. .. .. .. 0 1 0   |
|            | Gave John Staines by order of the vestry .. .. .. .. .. 0 10 6   |
|            | Gave John Aedy .. .. .. .. .. 0 2 0  |
|            | Gave a pass .. .. .. .. .. 0 0 6   |
|            | Gave a poor man .. .. .. .. .. 0 2 6   |
| ,, 5th.    | Paid Mr. Herridge for fetching furzes to the<br>workhouse, the 19th and 20th July last 0 7 0   |
| ,, 10th.   | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward Marsh's family 0 6 0  |
|            | Gave a pass .. .. .. .. .. 0 0 4   |
|            | Carried forward .. .. .. .. .. £41 10 8  |

|            |   |                       |     |    |   |
|------------|---|-----------------------|-----|----|---|
|            |   | Brought forward .. .. | £41 | 10 | 8 |
| Dec. 17th. | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward Marsh's family   | 0                     | 6   | 0  |   |
|            | Gave to two sailors .. .. ..  | 0                     | 0   | 6  |   |
| ,, 24th.   | Paid Mr. Leg for East End Pensioners,<br>from November 19th to December 24th,<br>as per bill .. .. ..   | 11                    | 12  | 6  |   |
|            | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward Marsh's family   | 0                     | 6   | 0  |   |
|            | Paid Mrs. Schofield for her child for four<br>weeks, to the 24th of December inst...  | 0                     | 12  | 0  |   |
|            | Paid Mr. Harrison for four weeks for Ann<br>King for the same time.. .. ..  | 0                     | 14  | 0  |   |
|            | Gave a pass .. .. ..  | 0                     | 0   | 4  |   |
| ,, 29th.   | Paid Mr. Tomlinson for fifty yards and a<br>half of blue sergo for gowns, aprons<br>and clothing for women and children in<br>the house, as per bill .. .. .. | 3                     | 15  | 11 |   |
|            | Paid for five pairs of blankets for the house   | 3                     | 3   | 0  |   |
|            | Gave Mr. Thomas for old Bonner .. ..  | 0                     | 5   | 0  |   |
|            | Paid for three large coverlets for the beds in<br>the house .. .. ..  | 1                     | 4   | 0  |   |
|            | Gave a woman and two children .. .. ..  | 0                     | 0   | 4  |   |
| ,, 31st.   | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward Marsh's family   | 3                     | 6   | 0  |   |
| ,, 31st.   | Paid Mrs. Aedy at the vestry .. ..  | 0                     | 5   | 0  |   |
|            | Paid Wm. Gaywood for half of the money<br>paid to a substitute in the supplementary<br>militia .. .. ..   | 4                     | 0   | 0  |   |
|            | Gave a poor woman with child .. ..  | 0                     | 0   | 6  |   |
|            | Gave Mrs. Aedy .. .. ..   | 0                     | 5   | 0  |   |
| Jan. 7th.  | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edwd. Marsh's family  | 0                     | 6   | 0  |   |
|            | Paid for a pair of shoes for Jas. Hildon's<br>child .. .. ..  | 0                     | 3   | 6  |   |
|            | Paid for a pair of shoes for the boy at<br>Payne's .. .. ..   | 0                     | 4   | 6  |   |
| ,, 9th.    | Gave John Staines wife .. .. ..   | 0                     | 2   | 6  |   |
|            | Gave to a pass.. .. ..  | 0                     | 0   | 3  |   |
|            | Gave Geo. Beck for a pair of shoes .. ..  | 0                     | 3   | 3  |   |
|            | Gave Mrs. Aedy .. .. ..   | 0                     | 3   | 0  |   |
| ,, 14th.   | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edwd. Marsh's family  | 0                     | 6   | 0  |   |
|            | Gave Geo. Beck .. .. ..   | 0                     | 2   | 0  |   |
|            | Gave a pass .. .. ..  | 0                     | 0   | 4  |   |
|            | Gave Woleston .. .. ..  | 0                     | 3   | 0  |   |
| ,, 21st.   | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edwd. Marsh's family  | 0                     | 6   | 0  |   |
|            | Gave to a pass.. .. ..  | 0                     | 0   | 4  |   |
|            | Gave 3 passes .. .. ..  | 0                     | 0   | 6  |   |
|            | Paid Mr. Attfield for 2 pairs of breeches<br>for Bird and Laman as per bill .. ..   | 0                     | 10  | 6  |   |
|            | Gave a woman with child .. .. ..  | 0                     | 0   | 6  |   |
|            | Carried forward .. ..   | £73                   | 18  | 11 |   |

|            |  |           |
|------------|--|-----------|
|            | Brought forward .. ..  | £73 18 11 |
| Jan. 21st. | Paid Mrs. Schofield for her child for 4 weeks<br>from December 24th to January 21st<br>instant .. .. .. ..   | ~ 0 12 0  |
|            | Paid Mrs. Harrison for nursing Ann King<br>for the same time.. .. .. ..  | 0 14 0    |
| ,, 28th.   | Paid Mr. Leg for the East-end pensioners<br>from the 24th December to the 21st<br>instant January .. .. .. ..  | 9 6 0     |
|            | Paid Mr. Penn for his care and maintenance<br>of the poor for 4 weeks from the 31st<br>December, 1798, to January 28th<br>instant, as per bill .. .. .. .. | 16 10 0   |
|            | Paid the usual allowance of the vestry .. ..   | 0 3 6     |
|            |  | 98 3 5    |
|            | Mr. Godson's 6 former vestries brought on..  | 243 2 2½  |
|            |  | £341 5 7¾ |

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Garratt do take a survey of the wooden house in order to erect a chimney and other necessary matters, and “to get it done the first opportunity.”

*Ordered*—“That the monthly vestries for the future be held immediately after divine service in the afternoon on the last Sunday “in every month.”

(Signed)                    J. GROCOCK,                    } Churchwardens.  
                                J. GARRATT,  
                                T. WILKINSON, Overseer.  
                                THOS. MEAD, Deputy Overseer.  
                                And 2 Inhabitants.

At a vestry held the 24th day of February, 1799.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Thomas Wilkinson, the North End “Overseer, be allowed the undermentioned bills and disbursements”:

1798.

Dec. 31st.    Paid Mr. Penn for his care and maintenance  
of the poor as per bill to the 31st inst. £20 12 6  
1799.

Jan. 2nd.    Paid Guest .. .. .. .. .. 0 9 0  
               Paid Phebe Banks .. .. .. .. .. 0 6 0  
               Gave a woman and two children .. .. .. 0 1 0  
               Paid John Ray .. .. .. .. .. 0 8 0  
               Paid Charles Jones .. .. .. .. .. 0 8 0

Carried forward .. .. .. £22 4 6

|           | Brought forward ..  | .. £ | 22   | 4  | 6    |
|-----------|---|------|------|----|------|
| Jan. 3rd. | Paid lodgings for a poor man ..   | ..   | 0    | 0  | 6    |
|           | Paid Mary Aldridge ..   | ..   | 0    | 5  | 3    |
|           | Paid Geo. Beach ..  | ..   | 0    | 2  | 0    |
| ,, 5th.   | Paid the North-end pensioners ..  | ..   | 1    | 12 | 0    |
| ,, 7th.   | Expenses going to the Sessions House ..   | ..   | 0    | 5  | 0    |
|           | Paid for the affidavit at ditto ..  | ..   | 0    | 5  | 0    |
| ,, 8th.   | Paid Miles Fitzwater for four weeks at 3s. 6d.                                    | ..   | 0    | 14 | 0    |
| ,, 9th.   | Relieved two passes ..  | ..   | 0    | 1  | 0    |
| ,, 10th.  | Relieved a pass ..  | ..   | 0    | 0  | 6    |
| ,, 11th.  | Gave Maria Aldridge ..  | ..   | 0    | 5  | 3    |
| ,, 12th.  | Paid the pensioners ..  | ..   | 1    | 12 | 0    |
|           | Gave Geo. Beach ..  | ..   | 0    | 2  | 0    |
| ,, 13th.  | Relieved a pass ..  | ..   | 0    | 0  | 6    |
| ,, 14th.  | Relieved a ditto ..   | ..   | 0    | 0  | 4    |
| ,, 16th.  | Paid Mary Guest ..  | ..   | 0    | 9  | 0    |
|           | Paid Phebe Banks ..   | ..   | 0    | 0  | 6    |
|           | Relieved Eliz. Ellis ..   | ..   | 0    | 0  | 6    |
| ,, 18th.  | Gave Maria Aldridge ..  | ..   | 0    | 5  | 3    |
| ,, 19th.  | Paid the pensioners ..  | ..   | 1    | 12 | 0    |
|           | Gave George Beach ..  | ..   | 0    | 2  | 0    |
|           | Relieved two passes ..  | ..   | 0    | 1  | 0    |
|           | Going to London with Mrs. Payne on the<br>enquiring after the child left with her | ..   | 0    | 6  | 6    |
| ,, 21st.  | Paid Miles Fitzwater ..   | ..   | 0    | 7  | 0    |
| ,, 23rd.  | Relieved two passes ..  | ..   | 0    | 0  | 10   |
| ,, 25th.  | Paid Phebe Banks ..   | ..   | 0    | 4  | 0    |
| ,, 26th.  | Expenses taking John Salt ..  | ..   | 0    | 7  | 0    |
|           | One days' attendance and keeping Sarah<br>Lawson ..                               | ..   | 0    | 5  | 0    |
| ,, 27th.  | Paid the pensioners ..  | ..   | 1    | 12 | 0    |
|           | Gave Geo. Beach ..  | ..   | 0    | 2  | 0    |
| ,, 28th.  | Paid Maria Aldridge ..  | ..   | 0    | 5  | 3    |
|           | Relieved two passes ..  | ..   | 0    | 1  | 0    |
| ,, 30th.  | Paid Mary Guest ..  | ..   | 0    | 9  | 0    |
|           | Paid Mr. John Hunt ..   | ..   | 0    | 4  | 6    |
| Feb. 1st. | Paid the pensioners ..  | ..   | 1    | 12 | 0    |
| ,, 2nd.   | Relieved two passes ..  | ..   | 0    | 1  | 0    |
| ,, 3rd.   | Relieved ditto ..   | ..   | 0    | 0  | 6    |
| ,, 4th.   | Relieved Richard Smith ..   | ..   | 0    | 7  | 6    |
| ,, 6th.   | Relieved two passes ..  | ..   | 0    | 1  | 0    |
| ,, 8th.   | Relieved a ditto ..   | ..   | 0    | 0  | 6    |
| ,, 9th.   | Paid the pensioners ..  | ..   | 1    | 10 | 0    |
|           | Gave Geo. Beach ..  | ..   | 0    | 2  | 0    |
| ,, 11th.  | Relieved two passes ..  | ..   | 0    | 1  | 0    |
| ,, 12th.  | Relieved a woman and child ..   | ..   | 0    | 0  | 6    |
| ,, 13th.  | Paid Mary Guest ..  | ..   | 0    | 9  | 0    |
| ,, 14th.  | Relieved two passes ..  | ..   | 0    | 1  | 0    |
| ,, 15th.  | Relieved a ditto ..   | ..   | 0    | 0  | 6    |
|           | Carried forward ..  | ..   | .. £ | 38 | 10 8 |

|   |   |                        |
|---|---|------------------------|
|   | Brought forward ..  | .. £38 10 8            |
| Feb. 16th.  | Paid the pensioners ..                                    | .. 1 10 0              |
|   | Gave Geo. Beach ..  | .. 0 2 0               |
| ,, 17th.  | Relieved a pass ..  | .. 0 0 6               |
| ,, 18th.  | Paid Miles Fitzwater ..                                   | .. 0 14 0              |
| ,, 19th.  | Relieved a pass ..  | .. 0 0 6               |
|   | Relieved two passes ..                                    | .. 0 1 0               |
|   | Relieved a ditto ..                                       | .. 0 0 4               |
|   | Paid John King for the half of his substitute ..          | 4 0 0                  |
|   | Paid for necessaries for Sarah Lawson being with child .. | 0 8 0                  |
|   | Relieved two passes ..                                    | .. 0 1 0               |
| ,, 23rd.  | Paid the pensioners ..                                    | .. 1 10 0              |
| ,, 24th.  | Relieved a pass ..  | .. 0 1 0               |
|   | The usual allowance of the vestry ..                      | .. 0 3 6               |
|   |   | £47 8 0                |
| Mr. Wilkinson's two former vestries brought on .. | .. .. .. ..   | 123 12 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ |
|   |   | £171 0 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ |

*Ordered*—“That notice be given in the Church on the two next Sundays for a vestry to be held on Wednesday, the 13th March next, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon, in the church, for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of an application to be made to the Lord Bishop of London for his grant to enclose a piece of waste ground for the erecting of a workhouse upon and other purposes for the use of the parish.”

(Signed)      J. GROCOCK, } *Churchwardens.*  
                   J. GARRATT, }  
                   THOS. WILKINSON, *Overseer.*  
                   And 8 Inhabitants.

At a vestry held the 13th day of March, 1799, in the Parish Church of Finchley, pursuant to notice given in the said church the two preceding Sundays, for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of an application to be made to the Lord Bishop of London for his grant to enclose a piece of waste ground for the erecting of a workhouse upon and other purposes for the use of the parish.

At the said vestry the above preamble was taken into consideration, and was put up to votes, and the majority of votes was given for an application to be made to the Lord Bishop of London for the aforesaid purposes.

(Signed)      J. GROCOCK, *Churchwarden.*  
                   THOMAS GODSON,  
                   THOMAS WILKINSON, } *Overseers.*  
                   And 10 Inhabitants.

*March 26th, 1799.*

At a Vestry held the 26th day of March, 1799, in the Parish Church of Finchley, pursuant to notice given in the said church the preceding Sunday, for the purpose of choosing churchwardens and nominating overseers of the poor of the said parish for the year ensuing.

When the under-mentioned inhabitants were chosen and nominated:—

EAST END.

*Churchwardens:*

William Clark.

James Tomlinson.

Thomas Singleton, Esq.

NORTH END.

*Churchwardens:*

Thomas Gildart, Esq., //////////////

T. H. Andrew, Esq., //

John Hunt, //

Mr. Wm. Clark was chosen by the rector, and Thomas Gildart, Esq., by the parishioners.

EAST END.

*Overseers:*

William Steer, Esq.

Jonas Davis.

Richard Vale.

NORTH END.

*Overseers:*

William Yarnold, Esq.

Lawrence Lyon.

Thomas Taunton.

(Signed)

RALPH WORSLEY, *Rector.*

J. GROCOCK, } *Churchwardens.*

J. GARRATT, } *Overseers.*

THOMAS GODSON,

THOMAS WILKINSON, } *Overseers.*

Autographs of 10 ratepayers.

---

At a Vestry held the 31st day of March, 1799, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That the present overseers be allowed the following “bills and disbursements, Mr. Thomas Godson, the present overseer “for the East-end, hath disbursed as under” :—

1799.

|            |  |     |    |    |
|------------|--|-----|----|----|
| Jan. 28th. | Gave to a pass .. .. .. ..   | £0  | 0  | 6  |
|            | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward Marsh's family .. .. .. ..  | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|            | Gave Mrs. Aedy .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 3  | 0  |
|            | Gave James Murrey .. .. .. ..  | 0   | 1  | 0  |
|            | Gave to a pass .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 0  | 6  |
|            | Paid Mr. Laman a bill for repairs at the poorhouse .. .. .. ..   | 10  | 10 | 4  |
| Feb. 4th.  | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward Marsh's family .. .. .. ..  | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|            | Paid Mary Bateman for her child from October 8th to February 4th inst., seventeen weeks at 2s. 6d. per week .. | 2   | 2  | 6  |
|            | Carried forward .. ..  | £13 | 9  | 10 |

|            |  |    |    |     |    |    |
|------------|--|----|----|-----|----|----|
|            | Brought forward ..   | .. | .. | £13 | 9  | 10 |
| Feb. 4th.  | Gave to a pass..   | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 4  |
| ,, 7th.    | Paid Mr. Bridgman, the high constable, the county levy bill and stamp ..   | .. | .. | 21  | 7  | 0  |
| ,, 11th.   | Paid Mrs. Payne for Marsh's  | .. | .. | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|            | Gave Mrs. Aedy ..  | .. | .. | 0   | 2  | 6  |
|            | Gave Woolerston ..   | .. | .. | 0   | 3  | 0  |
|            | Gave James Murray's mother ..  | .. | .. | 0   | 1  | 0  |
|            | Gave Mrs. Burton ..  | .. | .. | 0   | 1  | 0  |
|            | Gave Mrs. Hipgrave ..  | .. | .. | 0   | 1  | 0  |
|            | Paid Mrs. Jordan Platt's rent to Michaelmas last ..  | .. | .. | 2   | 11 | 0  |
|            | Gave a pass ..   | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 4  |
| ,, 18th.   | Paid Mrs. Payne for Marsh's  | .. | .. | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|            | Gave Jas. Murrey ..  | .. | .. | 0   | 1  | 0  |
|            | Gave Mrs. Aedy ..  | .. | .. | 0   | 2  | 6  |
|            | Paid for a woman and child that was taken ill in Whetstone: lodging, supper, breakfast and other expenses ..       | .. | .. | 0   | 4  | 0  |
|            | Gave to a pass..   | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 4  |
|            | Paid Mrs. Schofield for her child, four weeks from the 21st January to the 18th February at 3s. per week..         | .. | .. | 0   | 12 | 0  |
|            | Paid Mrs. Harrison for Ann King four weeks to 18th February..  | .. | .. | 0   | 14 | 0  |
|            | Paid for five yards of cloth and two pairs of stockings for Mrs. Freeman's children ..                             | .. | .. | 0   | 8  | 0  |
| Feb. 25th. | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward Marsh's family  | .. | .. | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|            | Paid Mr. Legg for the East-end pensioners for four weeks from the 21st January to the 18th February as per bill .. | .. | .. | 0   | 9  | 6  |
|            | Gave to a pass..   | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 4  |
|            | Paid Mr. Robins a bill for bread for the poor house to 21st June, 1798 ..  | .. | .. | 3   | 12 | 0  |
| Mar. 4th.  | Gave Allen Mrs. Jordan's haybinder ..  | .. | .. | 0   | 2  | 0  |
|            | Gave to a pass 4d., gave to a pass 2d.   | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 6  |
|            | Paid Mrs. Payne for Marsh's  | .. | .. | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|            | Gave a pass ..   | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 3  |
| ,, 11th.   | Paid Mrs. Payne for Marsh's  | .. | .. | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|            | Gave a pass ..   | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 4  |
|            | Gave Mrs. Pedley when she went out of the poor house ..  | .. | .. | 0   | 10 | 6  |
|            | Gave Allen Mrs. Jordan's haybinder ..  | .. | .. | 0   | 2  | 0  |
| ,, 13th.   | Paid the overseer of Bethnal Green for a militia man's family from the 13th August to 15th February ..             | .. | .. | 3   | 15 | 0  |
| ,, 18th.   | Paid Mrs. Payne for Marsh's  | .. | .. | 0   | 6  | 0  |
|            | Gave Mrs. Aedy ..  | .. | .. | 0   | 3  | 0  |
|            | Carried forward ..   | .. | .. | £50 | 10 | 3  |

|   |  |            |
|---|--|------------|
|   | Brought forward .. ..  | £50 10 3   |
| Mar. 18th   | Paid Mr. Fanks for Richard Cousins to<br>the 1st January, 1799, as per bill .. ..  | 23 7 6     |
|   | Paid Mrs. Schofield for her bill four weeks<br>from the 18th February to the 18th<br>March instant .. .. ..  | 0 12 0     |
|   | Paid Mrs. Harrison for nursing Ann King<br>from 18th February to 18th March four<br>weeks .. .. ..   | 0 14 0     |
|   | Gave to a pass .. .. ..  | 0 0 4      |
| ,, 25th.  | Paid Mrs. Payne for Marsh's ..   | 0 6 0      |
| ,, 26th.  | Paid at the vestry on Easter Tuesday,<br>nominating officers by order of the<br>said vestry .. .. ..   | 1 1 0      |
|   | Gave George Audsley for attending the<br>vestries .. .. ..   | 0 2 0      |
|   | Paid Mr. Penn for five weeks for his care<br>and maintenance of the poor from 25th<br>February to 1st April .. .. ..                                 | 17 12 6    |
|   | Paid Mr. Legg for five weeks that he has<br>paid the East-end pensioners, from the<br>18th February to the 25th March<br>inst., as per bill .. .. .. | 11 5 0     |
|   | Paid the usual allowance of the vestry ..  | 0 3 6      |
| Mr. Godson's seven vestries brought forward .. .. | 114 10 7   |            |
|   |  | 341 5 7½   |
|   |  | £455 16 2½ |

(Signed) J. GROCOCK, *Churchwarden.*

THOS. WILKINSON, *Overseer of the Poor.*

And 6 Inhabitants.

Mr. Thomas Wilkinson, the present North-end Overseer, his disbursements stand as under:—

1799.

|            |  |          |
|------------|--|----------|
| Feb. 25th. | Paid Richard Wallis's wife for Josh.<br>Hilsdon's child by order of the vestry<br>as a gratuity .. .. .. | £0 12 0  |
|            | Paid Mr. Penn for the poor as per bill to<br>the 25th of February instant .. ..                          | 16 2 6   |
| ,, 27th.   | Paid Mary Guest .. .. ..   | 0 9 0    |
|            | Gave to a pass 6d., gave to a pass 6d. .. ..   | 0 1 0    |
|            | Gave Turpin .. .. ..   | 0 1 0    |
| Mar. 2nd.  | Gave to a pass .. .. ..  | 0 0 6    |
|            | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..  | 1 10 0   |
| ,, 3rd.    | Gave a woman and two children .. ..  | 0 1 0    |
|            | Carried forward ..   | £18 17 0 |

|   |  |            |
|---|--|------------|
|   | Brought forward ..                                   | £18 17 0   |
| Mar. 5th.   | Relieved a pass 6d.; 6th, Relieved two passes 1s. .. | 0 1 6      |
| „ 9th.  | Paid the weekly pensioners ..                        | 1 10 0     |
| „ 11th.   | Relieved a pass ..                                   | 0 0 6      |
| „ 13th.   | Paid Mary Guest ..                                   | 0 9 0      |
| „ 15th.   | Relieved two passes ..                               | 0 1 0      |
| „ 16th.   | Paid the weekly pensioners ..                        | 1 10 0     |
| „ 17th.   | Gave to a pass 6d.; 20th, gave to a pass 6d.         | 0 1 0      |
| „ 21st.   | Gave to two passes ..                                | 0 1 0      |
| „ 23rd.   | Paid the weekly pensioners ..                        | 1 10 0     |
| „ 24th.   | Lodging for a poor woman ..                          | 0 1 0      |
| „   | Paid Miles Fitzwater for five weeks to this day ..   | 0 17 6     |
| „   | Relieved two passes ..                               | 0 1 0      |
| „ 25th.   | Expenses for a man found on the common ..            | 0 2 0      |
| „   | Gave to a pass ..                                    | 0 0 6      |
| „ 30th.   | Paid the weekly pensioners to the 30th instant ..    | 1 10 0     |
|   |  | 26 13 0    |
| Mr. Wilkinson's three former vestries brought on .. | 171 0 4½   |            |
|   |  | £197 13 4½ |

At a vestry held the 28th day of April, 1799, in and for the parish of Finchley, in the County of Middlesex.

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Thomas Godson, the late East End Overseer, be allowed the undermentioned Bills and Disbursements.”

1799.

|            |   |         |
|------------|---|---------|
|            | Paid Mary Bateman for her child, up to Easter Monday, March 25th ..   | £0 15 0 |
| Mar. 26th. | Gave George Audsley for attending vestries in the church ..   | 0 2 0   |
| „ 30th.    | Gave Mrs. Aedy, by order of Vestry ..   | 0 2 0   |
|            | Gave a pass ..  | 0 0 6   |
| April 1st. | Paid Mrs. Payne for Edward Marsh's family ..  | 0 6 0   |
|            | Gave a pass ..  | 0 0 4   |
| „ 8th.     | Paid at the Court at Highgate, per annual custom ..   | 1 0 0   |
|            | Paid Mrs. Payne for Marsh ..  | 0 6 0   |
|            | Gave to a pass ..   | 0 0 6   |
|            | Paid Francis Claridge for Edward White's lodging, from the 18th May, 1798, to the 22nd March, 1799, forty-four weeks .. | 2 4 0   |
|            | Gave to a pass ..   | 0 0 4   |
|            | Carried forward ..  | £4 16 8 |

|            |   |         |
|------------|---|---------|
|            | Brought forward .. .. ..  | £4 16 8 |
| Mar. 15th. | Paid Mrs. Payne for Marsh .. .. ..  | 0 6 0   |
|            | Gave a pass .. .. ..  | 0 0 3   |
|            | Paid for cutting furze for the workhouse,<br>27th June last .. .. ..  | 0 12 6  |
| ,, 22nd.   | Paid Mrs. Payne for Marsh .. .. ..  | 0 6 0   |
|            | Paid Mr. Audsley, as per bill, for shoes for<br>Hipgrave, White and Freeman's chil-<br>dren, &c. .. .. ..   | 1 9 0   |
|            | Paid Mrs. Schofield for her child, from the<br>18th March to the 22nd of April last,<br>five weeks at 3s. per week .. .. ..                                 | 0 15 0  |
|            | Paid Mrs. Harrison, for the same time, for<br>Ann King, at 3s. 6d. .. .. ..   | 0 17 6  |
|            | Paid Mr. Richards for two large washing<br>tubs, a large bread bowl, a flour shovel,<br>rolling-pin, and a wire cinder sieve, for<br>the workhouse .. .. .. | 1 1 8   |
| ,, 24th.   | Paid Mrs. Cox, as per bill, for beer had at<br>the workhouse, due the 26th July last  | 7 10 0  |
| ,, 25th.   | Paid William Smallbourn for his salary as<br>vestry clerk and other business to the<br>3rd of May, 1798, as per bill .. .. ..                               | 6 6 2   |
|            | Paid Mr. Legg for the East-end pensioners,<br>from the 25th March to the 22nd of<br>April inst., four weeks .. .. ..  | 9 0 0   |
|            | Paid Mr. Penn for the poor in the house, as<br>per bill, from the 1st April to the 29th<br>inclusive, four weeks .. .. ..                                   | 13 17 6 |
|            | Paid the usual allowance of the vestry .. ..  | 0 3 6   |
|            | Carried forward .. .. ..  | £47 1 9 |

Mr. Thomas Wilkinson, the late North End Overseer, has disbursed since the last vestry as under:—

| 1799.      |   |         |  |
|------------|---|---------|--|
| April 1st. | Gave to a pass 6d.; 3rd., Gave to two passes 9d.  | £0 1 3  |  |
| " 3rd.     | Gave Hannah Smith .. .. ..  | 0 2 6   |  |
| " 5th.     | Gave to two passes .. .. ..   | 0 1 0   |  |
| " 6th.     | Paid to North-end weekly pensioners ..  | 1 10 0  |  |
|            | Paid for a letter .. .. ..  | 0 0 2   |  |
| ,, 7th.    | Paid Miles Fitzwater for two weeks, from<br>the 24th March to the 7th of April, at<br>3s. 6d. per week .. .. .. | 0 7 0   |  |
| ,, 8th.    | Gave a pass, 6d.; 9th, Gave to four passes<br>1s. 6d. .. .. ..  | 0 2 0   |  |
| " 13th.    | Paid the weekly pensioners .. .. ..   | 1 10 0  |  |
| " 14th.    | Paid Miles Fitzwater for one week to this day   | 0 3 6   |  |
|            | Relieved two passes .. .. ..  | 0 0 8   |  |
|            | Carried forward .. .. ..  | £3 18 1 |  |

|  |   |                        |
|--|---|------------------------|
|  | Brought forward .. .. ..  | £3 18 1                |
| April 15th.  | Gave a ditto 6d.; 18th, gave a ditto 4d. ..   | 0 0 10                 |
| " 20th.  | Paid the weekly pensioners .. ..  | 1 10 0                 |
|  | Paid Miles Fitzwater for one week to the<br>21st inst. .. .. ..                       | 0 3 6                  |
|  | Paid Mr. Sanders as per bill for bread for<br>the workhouse in May, 1798 .. ..        | 3 19 4                 |
|  | Paid Mary Guest for six weeks from the<br>13th of March to the 24th of April inst.    | 1 7 0                  |
|  | Paid T. H. Andrew, Esq., the late overseer,<br>his balance due to him from the parish | 12 9 4                 |
|  |   | _____                  |
|  |   | 23 8 1                 |
| Mr. Wilkinson's four former vestries brought<br>on .. .. .. .. | 197 13 4 $\frac{3}{4}$  | _____                  |
|  |   | £221 1 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ |
|  |   | _____                  |

Ordered that as Brand Mallard is dead his  
widow be allowed 2s. 6d. per week for  
the future until further orders.

|   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| Mr. Godson's vestry of this day brought over                      | £47 1 9                  |
| Mr. Godson's eight former vestries brought<br>forward .. .. .. .. | 455 16 2 $\frac{3}{4}$   |
|   | _____                    |
|   | £502 17 11 $\frac{3}{4}$ |
|   | _____                    |

" It is unanimously agreed on by the inhabitants assembled at this present vestry, that Mr. John Lee, executor to the late Elizabeth Teal, and guardian to her son (a minor), who has made a regular application to the Lord Bishop of London, Lord of the Manor of Finchley, and to several of the inhabitants of the said parish, for leave to inclose a piece of waste ground opposite the White Lyon publick house, commonly called the Dirt House, in the parish of Finchley, containing about one acre, be the same more or less, he, the said John Lee, shall have leave to inclose the same. He, the said John Lee, for himself and his ward, and their successors doth agree to pay after the rate of one pound ten shillings per acre or in proportion to the quantity of ground inclosed (yearly and every year), so long as the same shall be inclosed, to the inhabitants of the parish of Finchley.

" JOHN LEE."

In conformity to a letter received from the inhabitants of the parish of Hampstead, requesting the inhabitants of Finchley to meet the inhabitants of Hampstead at the Spaniard, on Holy Thursday, the 2nd of May next, to ascertain the boundaries of the said parishes; and it is agreed on that the inhabitants of Finchley do meet the inhabitants of Hampstead, and go the boundaries of the said parish,

and that likewise that the inhabitants of Hornsey have notice to meet the inhabitants of Finchley on the same day, at half-past two o'clock, at the White Lion, commonly called the Dirt House, in the parish of Finchley.

(Signed)      J. GROCOCK, }  
                   J. GARRATT, } *Churchwardens.*  
                   THOS. TAUNTON, *Overseer.*  
                   Autographs of 13 Ratepayers.

### VESTRY MINUTES OF FINCHLEY.

#### NOTES AS TO YEAR BEGINNING EASTER SUNDAY, 1825.

The year 1825-6 affords an illustration of the work done in the same Parish 25 years later and ten years before the New Poor Law Act of 1834 was passed.

The population had now increased to 2,349 (Census 1821), the 1,200 acres of Common had been enclosed and distributed under the Finchley Enclosure Award, by which means the whole acreage (3,314) had become occupied and the rateable value had increased from £6,847 to £9,959 15s.

The poor rate was 3s. in the £.

25 Vestries were held.

The Vestry appointed constables, head boroughs, and paid their fees out of the poor rate, but the office of common driver was annulled on 24th April of this year. The Vestry Clerk received a salary of £10 a year.

In May the inhabitants repeated the perambulation of the boundaries of the parish.

In the same month they took judicious steps to defend themselves from toll bars proposed under a Turnpike Road Bill.

A return is made in September, 1825, of the expenditure out of the poor rate, to the Clerk of the House of Commons, from which it appears that the total expenditure is £1,551, of which £318 is spent on highways and other purposes than the relief of the poor.

On 17th November, 1825, the Vestry took into consideration a charter granted to the parish by King John

exempting the inhabitants from tolls, and it was resolved to take counsel's opinion upon it.

The case and opinion will be found below. Mr. Tindal there advises that freeholders and copyholders of the Manor of Finchley are exempted from all tolls except those imposed by Act of Parliament.

The Vestry, on the 27th November, made rules and regulations for the management of the Poor House, and on 23rd November is recorded the result of a careful inspection of the Workhouse and examination of the inmates.

The minutes of this year exhibit the inhabitants transacting successfully the whole of the work of the parish in every branch of administration, poor law, sanitary, highways, police and safe guarding, and watching with the keenest interest all its concerns. The accounts are in full detail, and shew what money they raised and how they spent it. They were audited and passed by the inhabitants at the Vestry in a business like manner.

---

1825-26.

#### MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

COPY VESTRY MINUTES FOR YEAR BEGINNING EASTER, 1825, AND  
ENDING EASTER, 1826.

*April 5th, 1825.*

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, and pursuant to notice given in the Church on the two last Sundays, for the purpose of appointing Churchwardens, and nominating Overseers for the ensuing year.

The under written persons were appointed and nominated to serve the said offices :—

The Rev. Mr. WORSLEY, in the chair.

#### *Churchwardens :*

Mr. John Lee was appointed by the Rector.

Mr. John Verrals by the inhabitants.

*Overseers.*

| <b>EAST END.</b>         | <b>NORTH END.</b>      |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| X Richard Hughs          | James Pope XXXXXX      |
| George Grisewood.        | Samuel Wimbush X       |
| North Nailor Savery.     | Charles Herring        |
| XXXXXX William Aedy.     | Wm. Hooper             |
| XX John Tatum.           | Peter Ramsey XX        |
| <i>Constables:</i>       |                        |
| James Frost } Con-       | Wm. Tooley             |
| William Chalk } stables. | James Matthews         |
| Robt. Claridge           | Ralph Worsley, Rector. |
| I. E. Stacey             | Wm. Aedy } Overseers.  |
| Ventriss Field           | James Pope }           |
| Richd. Legg              | Jo. Brewster           |
| Jas. Frost, Constable    | Nevil Smart            |
| Saml. Franklin           | Robt. Wilson.          |
| <i>Headboroughs:</i>     |                        |

**MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.***24th April, 1825.*

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, being the monthly Vestry, the following disbursements was allowed Mr. W. Aedy, the East End Overseer:—

|          |  |         |    |     |
|----------|--|---------|----|-----|
| March    | Mr. Aedy's account brought forward   | .. £826 | 8  | 5½  |
| 29th.—   | Paid allowance of vestry .. .. ..  | 0       | 5  | 6   |
|          | Relieved Mary Lee, ill .. .. ..  | 0       | 5  | 0   |
|          | Relieved Mrs. Smith, ill .. .. ..  | 0       | 2  | 0   |
|          | Relieved Mrs. Dimbleby, ill .. .. ..   | 0       | 2  | 6   |
|          | Paid three letters .. .. ..  | 0       | 2  | 6   |
|          | Relieved Mrs. Roberts and family .. .. ..  | 1       | 17 | 0   |
|          | Elizabeth Warren .. .. ..  | 0       | 8  | 0   |
|          | A pair of shoes for do. .. .. ..   | 0       | 2  | 6   |
|          | Paid for a stoat .. .. ..  | 0       | 0  | 4   |
| 6th.—    | Mary Lee, two weeks ill .. .. ..   | 0       | 5  | 0   |
|          | Paid for a hedgehog .. .. ..   | 0       | 0  | 4   |
|          | Six yards of calico .. .. ..   | 0       | 4  | 4   |
|          | Expenses going to Hackney with Mary Hebblewhite .. .. ..   | 0       | 2  | 6   |
|          | Paid Tooley, journey to London to apprehend G. Salt .. .. ..   | 0       | 7  | 6   |
|          | Mr. Taylor, as per bill .. .. ..   | 1       | 2  | 3   |
|          | J. Merrall's pension from December 6th, 1823, to April 11th, 1825, sixty-nine weeks at 2/6 per week .. .. .. | 8       | 12 | 6   |
|          | Mr. Pooley, bill for bread had by the poor .. .. ..  | 0       | 6  | 10½ |
| , 14th.— | Paid for a hedgehog .. .. ..   | 0       | 0  | 4   |
|          | Relieved Mr. Edmonds, ill .. .. ..   | 0       | 5  | 6   |
|          | Relieved Joseph Batchelor, ill .. .. ..  | 0       | 2  | 6   |
|          | Carried forward .. .. ..   | £841    | 3  | 5½  |

|   | Brought forward .. | £  | 8  | 4                | 5 | $\frac{1}{4}$ |
|---|--------------------|----|----|------------------|---|---------------|
| Mar. 14th.—Relieved Joseph Cross, six weeks ill   | ..                 | 1  | 10 | 0                |   |               |
| Mr. Wood, bill for meat .. .. ..  | ..                 | 1  | 5  | 4                |   |               |
| Elizabeth Warran .. .. ..   | ..                 | 0  | 1  | 6                |   |               |
| Mr. Skaif, for Sunday parish business .. ..   | ..                 | 0  | 3  | 0                |   |               |
| Mr. Anderson, for coals to the poorhouse ..   | 10                 | 3  | 0  |                  |   |               |
| Stamps and paper .. .. ..   | ..                 | 0  | 4  | 9                |   |               |
| Paid for letters .. .. ..   | ..                 | 0  | 2  | 8                |   |               |
| Moving a man to the poorhouse .. ..   | ..                 | 0  | 1  | 0                |   |               |
| Expenses removing Mary Hepplewhite from Hackney .. .. ..  | ..                 | 0  | 2  | 0                |   |               |
| April 21st.—Paid for Mary Hepplewhite, eighteen days board at the Refuge for the Destitute in Hackney Road .. .. .. | ..                 | 0  | 18 | 0                |   |               |
| Relieved John Goodhail, ill .. .. ..  | ..                 | 1  | 7  | 6                |   |               |
| Mr. Parbery, as per bill .. .. ..   | ..                 | 10 | 12 | 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ |   |               |
| Mr. Edwards, for London pensioners, as per bill up to April 9th, 1825, thirteen weeks .. .. ..                      | ..                 | 21 | 18 | 0                |   |               |
| Harriet Moore and children, four weeks .. .. ..   | ..                 | 1  | 13 | 6                |   |               |
| Mrs. Lynes, four weeks .. .. ..   | ..                 | 0  | 10 | 0                |   |               |
| Harriet Collins, four weeks .. .. ..  | ..                 | 0  | 16 | 0                |   |               |
| Mrs. Salt, four weeks .. .. ..  | ..                 | 0  | 16 | 0                |   |               |
| Mrs. Druce, for the care of Tooley's family .. .. ..  | ..                 | 0  | 6  | 0                |   |               |
| Hepplewhite's family, four weeks .. .. ..   | ..                 | 0  | 18 | 0                |   |               |
| Relieved casualties .. .. ..  | ..                 | 0  | 1  | 3                |   |               |
| Pensioners, four weeks to April 24th, 1825 .. .. ..   | ..                 | 33 | 16 | 0                |   |               |
|   |                    | £  | 9  | 28               | 9 | $\frac{3}{4}$ |

The following disbursements was allowed Mr. James Pope, the North End Overseer:—

|       |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |
|-------|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| April | Mr. Pope's account brought forward ..   | .. | £  | 5  | 56 | 8  | 1 |
|       | Relieved William Briers, ill .. .. ..   | .. | 0  | 2  | 6  |    |   |
|       | Relieved William Ivory, ill .. .. ..  | .. | 0  | 5  | 0  |    |   |
|       | Relieved Chas. Harrow, ill .. .. ..   | .. | 0  | 4  | 6  |    |   |
|       | Surratt's family .. .. ..   | .. | 0  | 11 | 6  |    |   |
|       | Relieved Elizabeth Walker .. .. ..  | .. | 0  | 4  | 0  |    |   |
|       | Relieved Casualties .. .. ..  | .. | 0  | 1  | 6  |    |   |
|       | Paid for letters .. .. ..   | .. | 0  | 3  | 0  |    |   |
|       | Paid for a polecat .. .. ..   | .. | 0  | 0  | 8  |    |   |
|       | Mr. Audsley, a year's salary as Vestry Clerk, due the 5th of April last .. .. ..                          | .. | 10 | 0  | 0  |    |   |
|       | Paid one year's land tax for the poorhouse to Lady Day, 1825 .. .. ..                                     | .. | 1  | 2  | 6  |    |   |
|       | Paid the Overseers of Cheshunt, fifty-two weeks pension for William Clapham, to March 19th, 1825 .. .. .. | .. | 10 | 8  | 0  |    |   |
|       | Carried forward .. .. ..  | .. | £  | 5  | 79 | 11 | 3 |

|       |   |      |    |   |
|-------|---|------|----|---|
| April | Brought forward.. .. ..   | £579 | 11 | 3 |
|       | Thos. Wilkinson, bill for constable's duty.. ..   | 6    | 0  | 3 |
|       | Thos. Scraes for Headborough duty .. ..   | 1    | 2  | 6 |
|       | Mrs. Graves, glazier's bill .. ..   | 3    | 17 | 3 |
|       | Paid allowance of Vestry nominating Overseer .. ..  | 3    | 3  | 0 |
|       | Mr. Audsley, bill for parish duty .. ..   | 3    | 7  | 6 |
|       | Relieved Wiggins's family .. ..   | 1    | 12 | 0 |
|       | Paid pensioners to the 24th instant .. ..   | 11   | 14 | 0 |
|       | Mr. Pain, bill for shoes .. ..  | 1    | 10 | 0 |
|       | Paid the Overseer of Farcham fifty-two weeks for Harriett Hale's pension up to March 22nd, 1825, at four shillings .. | 10   | 8  | 0 |
|       |   | £622 | 5  | 9 |

MR. JOHN LEE, Churchwarden, in the Chair.

*Ordered*—“That Hepplewhite be directed to attend the vestry on Wednesday next, concerning the conduct of his daughter Mary.

“And that Cross's family be relieved with twelve shillings.”

Wm. Dodd applied for a small piece of ground adjoining Wm. Goby's garden, to erect a shea to contain his carts, the same is referred to the next monthly Vestry; and the overseers are requested to renew the same and to make their report.

And that Mr. Brunt's pay be advanced to six shillings per week.

*Ordered*—“That Mrs. Ward's pay for her two children be entirely taken off.

“And that Margaret Grigg's pay be reduced to seven shillings per week.

“And that William Hall's pay be reduced to two shillings and sixpence per week.”

*Ordered*—“That the five children under the care of Mrs. Edwards in the poorhouse be put out to nurse, as the room they occupy in the poorhouse is very much wanted.”

*Ordered*—“That Frost's constable's bill be paid (£6 2s. 9d.), and his bill for common driving (£3 10s.).”

*Ordered*—“That the office of common driver be annulled from this day as to the salary paid by the parish.”

(Signed) JOHN LEE, *Chairman.*  
JOHN VERRALL, *Churchwarden.*

WM. AEDY,  
JAMES POPE, } *Overseers.*

And five Inhabitants.

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

April 27th, 1825.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, and pursuant to notice given in the Church on the two last Sundays, for the purpose of auditing and passing the accounts of the late overseers. Mr. Wm. Aedy, the East End overseer's accounts being produced stood as under:—

|       |  |        |    |    |               |  |
|-------|--|--------|----|----|---------------|--|
| April | Mr. Aedy's disbursements, brought forward  |        |    |    |               |  |
|       | ward .. .. .. ..   | £928   | 9  | 9  | $\frac{3}{4}$ |  |
| 24th  | —Paid allowance of vestry .. .. .. ..  | 0      | 5  | 6  |               |  |
|       | Relieved Mrs. Jas. Burton, ill .. .. .. ..   | 0      | 6  | 0  |               |  |
|       | Paid Frost bill for constable's duty .. .. .. ..   | 6      | 2  | 9  |               |  |
|       | Paid Frost one year's salary as common driver .. .. .. ..  | 3      | 10 | 0  |               |  |
|       | Relieved Cross's family, by order of the vestry .. .. .. ..  | 0      | 17 | 0  |               |  |
|       | Mr. Stacy for half a-year's medicines and attendance on the poor, due the 25th March, 1825, including 10s. 6d. for attendance on .. .. .. .. | 13     | 0  | 6  |               |  |
|       | Margt. Evans, as per receipt. Three journeys to London, self .. .. .. ..   | 1      | 10 | 0  |               |  |
|       | Defaulters and deficiencies, as on the other side .. .. .. ..  | 58     | 8  | 1  |               |  |
|       | Mr. Bean, bill for bread had by the poor .. .. .. ..   | 3      | 0  | 3  | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  |
|       | Paid at the Court Leet, Highgate .. .. .. ..   | 3      | 3  | 0  |               |  |
|       | Constables' and Headboroughs' Warrants .. .. .. ..   | 0      | 8  | 0  |               |  |
|       | Mr. Blundell, for bell ropes .. .. .. ..   | 3      | 3  | 0  |               |  |
|       |  | £1,022 | 3  | 11 | $\frac{1}{4}$ |  |

## Mr. Aedy's receipts:—

|  |      |    |                 |
|--|------|----|-----------------|
| Amount of first rate book made .. .. .. ..   | £402 | 12 | 9               |
| Amount of second rate book made .. .. .. ..  | 551  | 19 | 0               |
| Received a balance of Mr. Legg, late overseer .. .. .. ..  | 0    | 18 | $11\frac{3}{4}$ |
| Half a-year's rent of Mr. Cullum for the poorhouse field, due at Lady Day, 1825 .. .. .. ..        | 4    | 0  | 0               |
| Of the overseer of Chelsea, for 52 weeks' pay advanced to James Penny, at 2s. per week .. .. .. .. | 5    | 4  | 0               |
| August 7th—Received at Chelsea Hospital, W. Nix's pension, one quarter .. .. .. ..                 | 2    | 3  | $2\frac{1}{2}$  |
| , 14th—For Nix's pension, at the Excise Office, two quarters .. .. .. ..                           | 4    | 7  | $3\frac{1}{2}$  |
| Oct. 1st—Of Wm. Schofield, in a case of bastardy.. .. .. ..  | 10   | 3  | 6               |
| Nov. 4th—Of Mr. Cullum, for the poorhouse field, due at Michaelmas .. .. .. ..                     | 4    | 0  | 0               |
| Carried forward .. .. .. ..  | £985 | 8  | $8\frac{3}{4}$  |

|   |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
|---|--------------------------|----|---------|----|--------|------|-----------------|
|   | Brought forward..        | .. | ..      | .. | £985   | 8    | 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 1825  |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| Jan. 29th—At the Excise Office, W. Nix's pension,<br>one quarter .. .. .. .. 2 3 2  |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| Of the overseer of North Mimms, for money<br>advanced to the widow Segrave, 42 weeks<br>at 2s. 6d., up to 25th of March .. .. 6 2 6 |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| Sundry default rates, as per account pro-<br>duced .. .. .. .. .. 39 0 0  |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
|   |                          |    |         |    | £1,032 | 14   | 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| Disbursement, as appears on the other side 1,022 3 11 $\frac{1}{4}$   |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| Balance due to the parish .. .. .. 10 10 5 $\frac{1}{2}$  |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| Error in Mr. Johnson's rate charges, too<br>much.. .. .. .. 1 0 0   |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| Due to the parish .. .. .. .. 11 10 5 $\frac{1}{2}$   |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| <i>Defaulters.</i>  |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| Thos. Cousins .. £1 14 0  | William Barratt          | .. | £0 15 0 |    |        |      |                 |
| Moses Freemantle .. 1 13 3  | Mr. Dockerall, 2         | .. | 0 8 6   |    |        |      |                 |
| William Winterbourn 0 15 0  | Moses Surety ..          | .. | 0 4 0   |    |        |      |                 |
| Wm. Davis .. 1 3 0  | Philip Nott ..           | .. | 2 0 0   |    |        |      |                 |
| John Raphael .. 2 17 0  | Joseph Adams ..          | .. | 0 19 3  |    |        |      |                 |
| Jas. Avenal .. 0 15 0   | Mr. McDonald ..          | .. | 2 0 0   |    |        |      |                 |
| Mrs. Bangs .. 0 19 0  | Mr. Abbott ..            | .. | 2 0 0   |    |        |      |                 |
| Wm. Amos .. 1 13 3  | Mr. Thompson ..          | .. | 0 8 3   |    |        |      |                 |
| John Thorn .. 0 19 0  | Late Lynch ..            | .. | 2 0 6   |    |        |      |                 |
| Anna Schofield .. 1 6 3   | Mr. Williams, E.         | .. | 2 12 6  |    |        |      |                 |
| Mr. Curtis .. 2 14 0  | G. Bradford, relieved .. | .. | 0 7 6   |    |        |      |                 |
| Wm. Laman .. 0 15 0   | John Johnson ..          | .. | 21 4 0  |    |        |      |                 |
| Miss Baker .. 2 17 0  | Mrs. Redding ..          | .. | 0 11 3  |    |        |      |                 |
| Wm. Dodd .. 1 14 1  | Meeting House ..         | .. | 1 2 6   |    |        |      |                 |
|   |                          |    |         |    | £36    | 13   | 3               |
|   |                          |    |         |    | 21     | 14   | 10              |
|   |                          |    |         |    |        | £58  | 8 1             |
| Mr. Pope, the North End Overseer's accounts being produced,<br>stood as under:—   |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| Mr. Pope's account brought forward .. £662 5 9  |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| April 25th—Paid at the Hoxton House for Lunatics, on<br>account of Margaret Evans .. .. 50 0 0                                      |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| Paid John Grave's pension up to April 18th,<br>1825, 52 weeks at 4s., stamp and booking 10 9 0                                      |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| Defaulters and deficiencies as below stated 58 19 10  |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| Paid Mr. Peters, two letters.. .. 0 2 0   |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
| Four journeys to London on parish business 2 0 0  |                          |    |         |    |        |      |                 |
|   |                          |    |         |    |        | £743 | 16 7            |

| <i>Defaulters.</i> |           | <i>Defaulters.</i>    |            |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|
| G. Pain..          | .. £2 8 0 | A. W. Bergans, 2      | .. £0 17 6 |
| N. Shipway, 2..    | .. 1 6 3  | I. Clark ..           | .. 0 10 0  |
| Wm. Overton ..     | .. 1 8 6  | 13 on plan ..         | .. 0 3 0   |
| Thos. Newcombe ..  | .. 0 8 7  | 14 on plan ..         | .. 0 4 6   |
| Wm. Matthews ..    | .. 1 0 1  | Sampson Scraes ..     | .. 3 6 6   |
| Isaac Robinson ..  | .. 0 15 0 | Wm. Baker, 2..        | .. 1 1 9   |
| Mrs. Vovall ..     | .. 0 15 0 | Late Conant, E. ..    | .. 1 8 6   |
| Mr. Dean ..        | .. 0 15 0 | Mr. Davis, E. ..      | .. 0 8 9   |
| Mr. Boff, 2 ..     | .. 1 6 3  | Josh. Young, E. ..    | .. 1 18 0  |
| Mr. Carr ..        | .. 0 15 0 | Mr. Chapman ..        | .. 8 16 3  |
| Mr. Young ..       | .. 1 14 0 | Sl. Brook, E. ..      | .. 5 14 0  |
| Jas. Carter ..     | .. 6 6 0  | Mr. Wood, 2 ..        | .. 0 9 7   |
| John Inman ..      | .. 2 5 3  | Meeting house..       | .. 1 10 5  |
| Josh. Dixon ..     | .. 2 2 2  | D. Bacon ..           | .. 0 10 6  |
| Ann Maintain ..    | .. 1 2 9  | Mr. Gray ..           | .. 2 12 0  |
| Wm. Ing ..         | .. 1 0 1  | Late Routh, E. ..     | .. 1 10 0  |
| John Bacon ..      | .. 1 3 7  | Buxendale relieved .. | .. 0 10 0  |
| John Chapman..     | .. 0 17 6 |                       |            |
|                    | 27 9 0    |                       | 31 10 10   |
|                    |           |                       | £58 19 10  |

Money received by Mr. Jas. Pope :—

|  |      |     |       |
|--|------|-----|-------|
| Amount of first rate book, made April 28th, 1824 ..    | £229 | 10  | 1     |
| Amount of second rate book made, October 13th, 1824 .. | 414  | 18  | 6     |
| Sundry default rates, as per accounts produced ..      | ..   | 13  | 18 10 |
|  | 728  | 7   | 5     |
| Expended as appears on the other side ..               | 743  | 16  | 7     |
| Balance due to the overseer ..                         | ..   | £15 | 9 2   |

Mr. JOHN VERRALLS, Churchwarden, in the Chair.

The before written accounts have been examined and agreed to, and allowed to pass, and are hereby passed accordingly.

(Signed)

JOHN VERRALLS, *Chairman.*

WM. AEDY, }  
JAMES POPE, } *Overseers of the Poor.*

And six Inhabitants.

The overseers gave notice for a vestry to be held in the Church on Thursday, May 5th, 1825, for the purpose of making a rate for the relief of the poor and other allowable disbursements, at ten for eleven o'clock precisely.

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*May 5th, 1825.*

At a vestry held in the above Parish Church on the day and date above written, and pursuant to notice given in the Church on Sunday last, for the purpose of making a rate for the relief of the poor and other allowable disbursements.

Mr. JOHN LEE, Churchwarden, in the Chair.

*It was ordered and agreed:* "That a rate of one shilling and six-pence in the pound be made, and the same is made accordingly."

*Ordered:* "That notice be given in the Church on Sunday next, "for the inhabitants of this parish to perambulate the boundaries of "this parish on Thursday next."

It was represented to this vestry that a Bill is now in progress in the House of Commons for making a turnpike road from St. John's Chapel, in the parish of Saint Marylebone, to or near to the eight mile stone on the north road in this parish which takes in the whole of Ballard's Lane.

That some of the inhabitants of this parish had exerted themselves to get a Clause inserted in such Bill, that no turnpike or toll gate should be erected within the parish of Finchley, which Clause has been struck out.

That, in consequence, there is reason to apprehend that in case the said Bill, as it now stands, should pass into a law, turnpikes or toll gates may be erected on some of the said parish roads to the great annoyance and prejudice of the inhabitants of this parish.

That in order to prevent such an occurrence it has been suggested that the most advisable measure to be adopted will be to get the title of the Bill altered by striking out all the words after the words "Saint Marylebone," and inserting instead thereof "to and into a certain lane called Hendon lane, in the parish of Finchley." This alteration will occasion the intended new road to end and determine in Hendon lane, and in consequence no turnpike can be erected on any parts of the parish roads.

That this alteration will occasion a deviation from the intended line of road, inasmuch as instead of its crossing the parish road from Duckseter lane across Mr. Allen's field and through The Grove, it will come over two fields at the back of Mr. Robert Claridge's house into Hendon lane, which two fields are also the property of Mr. Allen, whose consent to this alteration is necessary to be obtained previous to the Bill going into a Committee.

*Resolved*—"That it appears to this vestry that if the said Bill, as "it now stands, should pass into a law, that the inhabitants of this "parish may be seriously inconvenienced by the erection of turnpikes "or toll bars on the parish roads, and that it is expedient for the "purpose of obtaining the proposed alteration in the title of the

" Bill to make application to Thomas Allen, Esquire, the owner of  
" such two fields, for his approbation and consent thereto in the  
" manner before stated."

*Resolved*—" That application be made to Mr. Allen for the above  
" purpose, and a copy of these resolutions transmitted to him."

Mr. Allen's answer and consent to the above.

I HEREBY CONSENT to the alteration in the title of the Bill pro-  
posed in the above resolution, and also to the proposed deviation from  
the line of road originally pointed out to that of a road across my two  
fields at the back of Mr. Robert Claridge's house ending in Hendon  
lane as therein stated.

(Signed)

THOS. ALLEN,

Heneretta Street,

9th of May, 1825.

Witness, J. G. SEATON.

(Signed) JNO. LEE, *Chairman.*

WM. AEDY, } *Overseers.*

JAMES POPE, }

And 11 Inhabitants.

### MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

May 29th, 1825.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, being the  
monthly vestry, the following disbursements were allowed Mr.  
William Aedy, the East End Overseer.

|             |   |          |
|-------------|---|----------|
| 1825.       | Paid for warrant and books .. .. ..                             | £0 15 0  |
| April 27th. | Allowance of vestry passing the overseer's<br>accounts .. .. .. | 3 3 0    |
| May 1st.    | Relieved Ann Lee, ill .. .. ..                                  | 0 5 0    |
| ,, 2nd.     | Soap and candles for the poor house ..                          | 0 10 3   |
| ,,          | Mrs. Edwards for two casualties ..                              | 0 14 0   |
| ,, 3rd.     | Mr. Bean for church rolls .. .. ..                              | 1 9 6    |
| ,, 8th.     | Conveying a man ill to the poor house ..                        | 0 1 6    |
| ,,          | Mrs. James Burton, ill .. .. ..                                 | 0 4 0    |
| ,, 9th.     | S. Puddyfoot, out of employ .. .. ..                            | 0 2 6    |
|             | Paid for four letters .. .. ..                                  | 0 1 0    |
|             | Mrs. Edwards for two casualties .. .. ..                        | 0 14 0   |
|             | Gave Mrs. Edwards leaving the poor house ..                     | 0 2 6    |
| ,, 16th.    | Expenses of a jury on William Hall ..                           | 0 12 0   |
|             | A shirt for John Axom .. .. ..                                  | 0 3 6    |
|             | Mr. Shafe for sundry parish business ..                         | 0 13 0   |
| ,, 18th.    | Paid for two hedgehogs .. .. ..                                 | 0 0 8    |
|             | Relieved Mrs. Dix, ill .. .. ..                                 | 0 2 6    |
|             | Mrs. Hall, ill .. .. ..   | 0 2 0    |
|             | Ann Lee, ill .. .. ..   | 0 5 0    |
|             | Elizabeth Warren .. .. ..                                       | 0 1 0    |
| <hr/>       |   |          |
|             | Carried forward .. .. ..  | £10 1 11 |

|           |  |    |    |    |     |    |    |
|-----------|--|----|----|----|-----|----|----|
|           | Brought forward ..                                 | .. | .. | .. | £10 | 1  | 11 |
| May 23rd— | Mrs. Dix ..  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 7  | 6  |
|           | Mrs. Hall ..                                       | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 7  | 0  |
|           | Mrs. Smith ..                                      | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 2  | 6  |
|           | Mrs. Salt, five weeks ..                           | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 0  | 0  |
|           | Mrs. Lyons, five weeks ..                          | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 12 | 6  |
|           | Mrs. Edwards for a casualty man, three weeks ..    | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 1  | 0  |
|           | Mrs. Wm. Bacholar ..                               | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 1  | 6  |
|           | Paid for two letters ..                            | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 0  | 6  |
|           | Cross's family, four weeks ..                      | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 0  | 0  |
|           | Harriet Moore and two children, five weeks ..      | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 18 | 0  |
|           | Harriet Collins and two children, five weeks ..    | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 0  | 0  |
|           | Elizabeth Duke ..                                  | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 7  | 6  |
| ,, 28th—  | Paid Mrs. Druce for the care of Tooley's family .. | .. | .. | .. | 0   | 7  | 6  |
|           | Relieved Hepplewhite's family, five weeks ..       | .. | .. | .. | 1   | 3  | 9  |
|           | Pensioners, five weeks up to May 28th, 1825 ..     | .. | .. | .. | 41  | 10 | 0  |
|           |  |    |    |    | £61 | 1  | 2  |

The following disbursements was allowed Mr. James Pope, the North End Overseer.

|             |  |    |    |         |
|-------------|--|----|----|---------|
| May, 1825.— | Paid for warrant of appointment and books ..                         | £0 | 15 | 0       |
|             | Relieved Wm. Ivory, ill ..   | .. | .. | 1 0 0   |
|             | Wiggins's family, five weeks ..                                      | .. | .. | 1 3 0   |
|             | Thos. Wilden ..  | .. | .. | 0 3 6   |
|             | Thos. Smith's family ..  | .. | .. | 0 15 6  |
|             | Chas. Harrow ..  | .. | .. | 0 4 6   |
|             | Relieved Surratt's family ..   | .. | .. | 0 14 0  |
|             | Relieved Mrs. Grear ..   | .. | .. | 0 2 0   |
|             | Relieved casualties ..   | .. | .. | 0 3 6   |
|             | Tooley bill for Headborough's duty ..                                | .. | .. | 0 15 0  |
|             | Mr. Scaf for sundry parish business ..                               | .. | .. | 0 13 6  |
|             | Allowance of vestry nominating overseers ..                          | .. | .. | 3 3 0   |
|             | Journey to Hoxton on account of Margaret Evans ..                    | .. | .. | 0 10 0  |
|             | Paid for examination and warrant in a case of bastardy Eliza Duke .. | .. | .. | 0 3 6   |
|             | Mrs. Cooper for five dozen and six cockades for the perambulation .. | .. | .. | 1 13 0  |
|             | One hundred white wands for the perambulation ..                     | .. | .. | 0 5 6   |
|             | Paid for letters ..  | .. | .. | 0 1 9   |
|             | Three hedgehogs ..   | .. | .. | 0 1 0   |
|             | Pensioners five weeks, May 29th, 1825 ..                             | .. | .. | 12 10 0 |

£24 17 3

Mr. LEE the Churchwarden in the Chair.

The perambulation of the parish boundaries was performed on Thursday, May 12th, 1825 as per order made at a vestry on the 5th of May last.

*Ordered*—“That Widow Cousins be allowed two shillings per week.”

Mrs. Davis applied to have her poor rate relieved, which was objected to.

“It was AGREED by this vestry that Mrs. Edwards should have ‘‘Fanny Brown with her in the poor house.’’”

Eliza Darby was ordered a pair of shoes.

Thos. Smith had permission to take his son out of the poorhouse.

“Wm. Dood applied for leave to put his carts on a piece of ground adjoining the cottages belonging to this parish near the Red Lion, “It was agreed that he have the same on paying sixpence per month “to the Overseer for the time being, and his agreeing to quit the “same at a month’s notice when required.””

“Mrs. Smith was allowed a bedstead.”

“John Ray was ordered a pair of shoes.”

JNO. LEE.

(Signed) JOHN VERRALLS, *Churchwarden.*  
WM. AEDY, } *Overseers of the  
JAMES POPE, } Poor.*

And four Inhabitants.

### MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

June 26th, 1825.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day and date, being the monthly vestry, the following disbursements was allowed Mr. William Aedy, the East End Overseer:—

|          |  |        |    |    |
|----------|--|--------|----|----|
| 1825     | Mr. Aedy's account brought forward                               | .. £61 | 1  | 2  |
| May 29th | Paid allowance of vestry   | .. ..  | 0  | 5  |
| June 3rd | Tooley bill for Headborough's duty                               | .. ..  | 1  | 15 |
|          | Mr. Paris for the room, on account of Wm.<br>Hall .. .. .. .. .. | 0 10   | 6  |    |
| ,, 12th  | Expenses at the “Green Man,” with a casualty                     | 0 2    | 6  |    |
| ,, 13th  | Mrs. Edwards, for a casualty man, twelve<br>days .. .. .. .. ..  | 0 12   | 0  |    |
| ,, 20th  | Joseph Cross, four weeks .. .. .. .. ..                          | 1 0    | 0  |    |
|          | Ann Lee, ill four weeks .. .. .. .. ..                           | 0 10   | 0  |    |
|          | Relieved Richard Austin .. .. .. .. ..                           | 0 2    | 6  |    |
|          | Sarah Sharp's child, thirteen weeks at 3s. .. ..                 | 1 19   | 0  |    |
|          | Wm. Bacholar's family .. .. .. .. ..                             | 0 18   | 6  |    |
| <hr/>    |  |        |    |    |
|          | Carried forward .. .. .. .. ..                                   | £68    | 16 | 2  |

|   | Brought forward | .. | .. | £68  | 16 | 2 |
|---|-----------------|----|----|------|----|---|
| June 20th.—Wm. Wakefield's family   | ..              | .. | .. | 0    | 11 | 0 |
| Relieved casualties   | ..              | .. | .. | 0    | 1  | 0 |
| Paid for two letters  | ..              | .. | .. | 0    | 0  | 6 |
| Mrs. Hall   | ..              | .. | .. | 0    | 14 | 6 |
| Harriett Moore and two children   | ..              | .. | .. | 1    | 18 | 3 |
| Harriett Collins, four weeks  | ..              | .. | .. | 0    | 16 | 0 |
| Nine yards of calico at 9d.   | ..              | .. | .. | 0    | 6  | 9 |
| Mr. Norbery for a lunch had by the persons<br>who perambulated the parish boundaries<br>on Holy Thursday last | ..              | .. | .. | 13   | 4  | 6 |
| William Norris, for attendance on the<br>perambulation  | ..              | .. | .. | 0    | 2  | 6 |
| ,, 25th.—E. Salt, three weeks   | ..              | .. | .. | 0    | 12 | 0 |
| E. Warren, three weeks  | ..              | .. | .. | 0    | 12 | 0 |
| Hepplewhite's family  | ..              | .. | .. | 0    | 19 | 0 |
| Mrs. Edwards, for two casualties  | ..              | .. | .. | 0    | 14 | 0 |
| Gave a poor leaving the poor house  | ..              | .. | .. | 0    | 2  | 0 |
| Eliza Duke, four weeks  | ..              | .. | .. | 0    | 16 | 0 |
| Pensioners, four weeks  | ..              | .. | .. | 32   | 16 | 0 |
|   |                 |    |    | £123 | 2  | 5 |

The following disbursements was allowed Mr. James Pope, the North End Overseer:—

|      |  |     |    |   |
|------|--|-----|----|---|
| June | Mr. Pope's account brought forward..   | 24  | 17 | 3 |
|      | Relieved Joseph Smith ..   | 0   | 4  | 0 |
|      | Do. Wm. Steward ..   | 0   | 5  | 0 |
|      | Wm. Briers, ill ..   | 0   | 4  | 0 |
|      | Jas. Williss, ill ..   | 0   | 10 | 0 |
|      | Surratt's family ..  | 0   | 6  | 0 |
|      | Casualties ..  | 0   | 2  | 6 |
|      | Robinson's child ..  | 1   | 0  | 0 |
|      | Journey to Bromley on account of Susan<br>Moore ..                                 | 0   | 12 | 0 |
|      | Rev. Mr. Worsley, two year's rent for the<br>churchyard, due at Midsummer, 1825 .. | 4   | 4  | 0 |
|      | Paid for sparrows ..   | 0   | 0  | 6 |
|      | Pensioners four weeks to 26th June, 1825 ..  | 9   | 0  | 0 |
|      |  | £41 | 5  | 3 |

Mr. LEE, Churchwarden, in the chair.

Mr. Lee, the Churchwarden, was requested to see Mr. Murray, to inquire of him whether he can give any information as to the repairs done at any time by the fee offees to the well or pump near the "Green Man" on Finchley Common.

Mrs. Cross was relieved with half-a-crown.

Mrs. Barker's pay was advanced to three shillings a week.

*Ordered*: "That notice be given in the Church for a vestry to be held in the Church on Wednesday, the 13th of July next, at six o'clock in the evening precisely; for the purpose of taking into consideration the state of the encroachments made on the highways and roads in this parish."

"And that the following report of Mr. Cumming's be entered in this book:—

"The undersigned, George Cuming, having been requested by the inhabitants of Finchley at vestry assembled (which order was communicated to me by their surveyor of the roads, Mr. Laman) to view and mark out a certain road branching out of the Finchley Road over the Hogmarket, and leading to the Great North Road. I have so set out the same in the manner and of the width that it was set out by me at the time of the Finchley enclosure by order of the Commissioners, and I have this day caused stakes to be driven marking out the bounds of the said road, which I have done as originally set out by me, corresponding with the plan upon which the Commissioners first set out the roads. Witness my hand—

"G. CUMING,

"11th June, 1825."

(Signed) JNO. LEE, *Chairman*.  
WM. AEDY, } Overseers.  
JAMES POPE, }  
And eleven Inhabitants.

### MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*July 31st, 1825.*

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day and date, being the monthly vestry, the following disbursements was allowed Mr. Wm. Aedy, the East End Overseer.

|   |                                       |      |    |           |
|---|---------------------------------------|------|----|-----------|
|   | Mr. Aedy's account brought forward .. | £123 | 2  | 5         |
| June 26th.—Paid allowance of vestry ..  | ..                                    | ..   | 0  | 5 6       |
| Mrs. Cross, by order of vestry ..   | ..                                    | ..   | 0  | 2 6       |
| Wm. Rudd, by order of vestry ..   | ..                                    | ..   | 0  | 2 6       |
| ,, 28th.—Paid Frost and Kirby for conveying a man to prison by order of Dr. Owen .. | ..                                    | 0    | 10 | 0         |
| July 12th.—Expenses of jury held on John Platt ..                                   | ..                                    | 0    | 13 | 0         |
| Eliza Duke, one week ..   | ..                                    | ..   | 0  | 4 0       |
| Martha Hall, for nursing Mrs. Allen ..  | ..                                    | 0    | 3  | 0         |
| Relieved Widow Hall ..  | ..                                    | ..   | 0  | 2 0       |
| Phillip Robinson, ill ..  | ..                                    | ..   | 0  | 5 0       |
| James Ford, ill ..  | ..                                    | ..   | 0  | 9 0       |
| Paid for three letters ..   | ..                                    | ..   | 0  | 0 9       |
|   | Carried forward ..                    | ..   | .. | £125 19 8 |

|   |                    |              |
|---|--------------------|--------------|
|   | Brought forward .. | .. £125 19 8 |
| July 12th—Relieved casualties ..  | .. .. ..           | 0 1 6        |
| Paid for sparrows ..  | .. .. ..           | 0 0 7        |
| Relieved Widow Platt ..   | .. .. ..           | 0 12 6       |
| Ann Lee, five weeks ill ..  | .. .. ..           | 0 12 6       |
| Wm. Amos, ill ..  | .. .. ..           | 0 7 6        |
| July 23rd—Paid for soap and candles, &c., for poorhouse for 12 weeks ..         | .. .. ..           | 1 14 6½      |
| Plums and currants, &c., for poorhouse on Whit-Sunday ..                        | .. .. ..           | 0 3 9        |
| ,, 28th—Joseph Cross, five weeks ..   | .. .. ..           | 1 5 0        |
| Hepplewhite's family, five weeks ..   | .. .. ..           | 1 3 9        |
| Mr. Edwards, for sundry casualties in the poorhouse, five weeks ..              | .. .. ..           | 3 7 6        |
| Relieved Elizth. Salt ..  | .. .. ..           | 0 10 0       |
| Elizth. Warren ..   | .. .. ..           | 0 10 0       |
| Paid Mr. Edwards for London pensioners, from April 9th to July 9th, 13 weeks .. | .. .. ..           | 21 7 0       |
| Harriet Collins, five weeks ..  | .. .. ..           | 1 0 0        |
| Relieved Wm. Howard ..  | .. .. ..           | 0 10 0       |
| Paid pensioners five weeks to July 30th ..                                      | .. .. ..           | 41 2 6       |
|   |                    | £200 8 3½    |

The following disbursements was allowed Mr. James Pope, the North End Overseer:—

|      |   |            |
|------|---|------------|
|      | Mr. Pope's account, brought forward   | £41 5 3    |
| July | —Relieved Thos. Wilden ..   | 0 2 6      |
|      | Robt. Adams relieved ..   | 0 12 6     |
|      | James Smith, ill ..   | 0 7 0      |
|      | A shirt for James Smith ..  | 0 3 9      |
|      | Conveying James Smith to poorhouse ..   | 0 2 0      |
|      | Relieved Joseph Smith ..  | 0 5 0      |
|      | Wm. Briers, ill ..  | 0 2 0      |
|      | John Thirby, ill ..   | 0 3 0      |
|      | Mrs. Greer ..   | 0 2 0      |
|      | Wm. Ivory's family ..   | 0 10 0     |
|      | A casualty woman, ill ..  | 0 4 6      |
|      | Relieved casualties ..  | 0 4 0      |
|      | Jas. Carter, for removing Surratt's family to Hackney ..                                      | 0 10 0     |
|      | Mr. Hammond, one year's salary for medicines and attendance on the poor, to Lady Day, 1825 .. | 15 0 0     |
|      | Joseph Foskett, one year as common driver ..  | 3 11 0     |
|      | Pensioners, five weeks to July 31st, 1825 ..  | 10 5 0     |
|      | Carried forward ..  | .. £73 9 6 |

|      |  |     |    |   |
|------|--|-----|----|---|
|      | Brought forward .. ..  | £73 | 9  | 6 |
| July | To three journeys and expenses on account<br>of Ann Roberts' family, in a case of<br>appeal with Lewisham parish .. .. | 3   | 0  | 0 |
|      | Paid Elizth. Davis for attendance on account<br>of do. .. .. .. ..   | 0   | 7  | 6 |
|      |  | £76 | 17 | 0 |

Mr. WORSLEY in the Chair.

The order made at the last monthly vestry, for a vestry to be held on the 13th instant, to take into consideration the encroachments made on the roads and highways in this parish, being postponed by public notice to this day.

The nuisance complained of having been partially removed, the above business of the roads is deferred for the present till Mr. Laman makes a further report.

Mrs. Watson was ordered five shillings for her assistance on Mrs. Wilding in her lying-in, and that the widow Ivory and four children be allowed ten shillings per week.

Mrs. Burton was ordered her mother's goods (Mary Allen), who died in the almshouse a fortnight ago.

Mr. Salt was ordered some temporary relief.

And William Amos was ordered to be relieved by Mr. Aedy, he being ill.

And that the widow John Platt and three children be allowed seven shillings and sixpence per week.

Mr. Smart was requested to see Mr. Chandler, landlord of the "Green Man," on Finchley Common, and to state to him that the pump near his premises is considered as belonging to and for the general use of the parishioners, and if he agreed to it being for general use, the fee offees or parish will pay him for the pump as it now stands, otherwise a pump will be erected over the well for the use of the parish.

(Signed) RALPH WORSLEY, *Rector.*

JNO. LEE, *Churchwarden.*

WM. AEDY } *Overseers.*  
JAMES POPE }

And six Inhabitants.

MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY,

August 28th, 1825.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, being the monthly vestry, the following disbursements was allowed Mr. William Aedy, the East End Overseer.

|           |  |         |    |    |
|-----------|--|---------|----|----|
|           | Mr Aedy's account brought forward  | .. £200 | 8  | 3½ |
| July 31st | Paid allowance of vestry ..  | .. 0    | 5  | 6  |
| Aug. 13th | Paid J. Hutton, bill for shaving the poor,<br>29 weeks to July 24th, 1825 .. | .. 1    | 16 | 0  |
|           | Mr. Boston for a saucepan for the poorhouse                                  | 0       | 1  | 11 |
|           | Mr. Scaief for sundry parish business ..                                     | .. 0    | 15 | 0  |
|           | Relieved Robert Adams ..   | .. 0    | 4  | 0  |
|           | Relieved Ann Threader ..   | .. 0    | 5  | 0  |
| ," 12th   | Paid for a letter ..   | .. 0    | 0  | 3  |
| ," 14th   | Relieved Elizabeth Salt ..   | .. 0    | 13 | 0  |
| ," 18th   | Relieved William Brown, ill ..   | .. 0    | 5  | 6  |
|           | William Amos, ill ..   | .. 0    | 15 | 0  |
|           | Ann Lee, ill ..  | .. 0    | 10 | 0  |
| ," 22nd   | Thomas Smith in the poorhouse, ill ..  | .. 1    | 8  | 0  |
|           | Cross's family, four weeks ..  | .. 1    | 0  | 0  |
| ," 27th   | William Howard, four weeks ..  | .. 0    | 16 | 0  |
|           | E. Warren, four weeks ..   | .. 0    | 16 | 0  |
|           | Mrs. Edwards for casualties, ill in the poor-<br>house, four weeks ..        | .. 2    | 8  | 0  |
|           | Do. for Harriet Collins, four weeks ..                                       | .. 1    | 8  | 0  |
|           | Hepplewhite's family, four weeks ..  | .. 1    | 0  | 0  |
|           | Paid pensioners, four weeks to August 27th                                   | 33      | 14 | 0  |
|           |  | £248    | 9  | 5½ |

The following disbursements was allowed Mr. James Pope, the North End Overseer.

1825.

|        |  |        |    |   |
|--------|--|--------|----|---|
| August | Mr. Pope's account, brought forward  | .. £76 | 17 | 0 |
|        | — Relieved William Briers, out of employ ..                                | .. 0   | 7  | 0 |
|        | Do. Robert Adams ..  | .. 0   | 3  | 0 |
|        | John Kirby, ill ..   | .. 0   | 10 | 0 |
|        | Joseph Smith's family, ill ..  | .. 0   | 12 | 6 |
|        | James Darby, ill ..  | .. 1   | 12 | 0 |
|        | Samuel Harris, out of employ ..  | .. 0   | 9  | 0 |
|        | Relieved Casnalties ..   | .. 0   | 3  | 0 |
|        | Mrs. Wilding's nurse, by order of vestry ..                                | .. 0   | 5  | 0 |
|        | Paid for paper and pens for the use of the<br>parish ..                    | .. 0   | 13 | 2 |
|        | Removing two poor men, ill, to the poor-<br>house ..                       | .. 0   | 4  | 0 |
|        | Journey to London about Robert Adams'<br>settlement ..                     | .. 0   | 10 | 0 |
|        | Orders of removal and removing do. to Saint<br>George's, Hanover Square .. | .. 0   | 13 | 6 |
|        | Relieved do. ..  | .. 0   | 1  | 0 |
|        | Orders of removal for Ann Threader ..                                      | .. 0   | 3  | 6 |
|        | Carried forward ..   | .. £83 | 3  | 8 |

|        |  |      |   |   |
|--------|--|------|---|---|
|        | Brought forward ..   | £83  | 3 | 8 |
| August | —Removing do. and three children to Stamford Rivers, in Essex, 25 miles at 2s.<br>per mile .. .. .. .. .. 2 10 0 |      |   |   |
|        | Relieved do. .. .. .. .. .. 0 3 6  |      |   |   |
|        | Paid for five letters .. .. .. .. .. 0 2 3   |      |   |   |
|        | Pensioners, four weeks to August 28th, 1825 9 18 0   |      |   |   |
|        | Paid Mr. Parbery, as per bill .. .. .. 17 11 9   |      |   |   |
|        |  | £113 | 9 | 2 |

Rev. Mr. WORSLEY, in the Chair.

Mr. Legg reported to this vestry that Mr. Chandler, the landlord of the "Green Man," on the Common, had been applied to by Mr. Smart concerning the pump near his house, and he acknowledges that the said pump is the property of the parish, and may be for the general use of the parish provided he receives the amount the pump cost him, and the overseer was ordered to erect a pump for the above purpose near the said place and reimburse Mr. Chandler.

Saml. Harris applied for relief, Mr. Verrals gave him employ.

Mr. Moore proposed, and was seconded by Mr. Ed. Rouse, that all persons keeping dogs shall not receive any parochial relief in future.

And that Mr. Cross's family was ordered to receive seven shillings and sixpence per week, he being very ill.

Joseph Adams having deserted his wife and she has become chargeable to the parish, it is ordered the overseer have him before a magistrate and punished.

Mrs. Hepplewhite applied for relief, being ill, Mr. Aedy was ordered to give her some temporary relief.

The house belonging to this parish, occupied by William Dix, being out of repair, it was ordered that the same be attended to.

*Ordered*—"That Mr. Legg's, Mr. Franklin's and Mr. Audley's "bills be paid."

(Signed)      RALPH WORSLEY, *Chairman.*  
 JNO. LEE,  
 JOHN VERRALLS, } *Churchwardens.*  
 WM. AEDY,  
 JAMES POPE, } *Overseers.*  
 And nine Inhabitants.

COPY OF AN ACCOUNT sent Sept. 20th, 1825, to the Clerk of the House of Commons, of the expenditure of the poor rate from 25th of March, 1824, to the 25th of March, 1825:

|   |        |    |   |
|---|--------|----|---|
| Money levied .. .. .. .. ..   | £1,609 | 10 | 6 |
| Total expended .. .. .. .. ..   | 1,551  | 8  | 3 |
| Amount of money paid for any other purposes<br>than the relief of the poor .. .. .. | 318    | 4  | 1 |
|   | £1,233 | 4  | 2 |

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY,

Sept. 22nd, 1825.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, and pursuant to notice given in the Church on the two last Sundays, for the purpose of nominating fit and qualified persons to serve the office of surveyors of the highways, for the year ensuing.

JOHN LEE, Churchwarden, Chairman.

The underwritten persons were nominated to serve the said office :—

| EAST END.              | NORTH END.                 |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| John Ray.              | Samuel Wimbush.            |
| John Laman, I I I I I. | Moses Taylor, I I I I.     |
| James Brewster.        | William Hopper, I I I.     |
| John Tatum.            | William Richards.          |
| George Grisewood, I.   | John Walker.               |
| (Signed)               | JNO. LEE, <i>Chairman.</i> |
|                        | WM. AEDY, <i>Overseer.</i> |
|                        | And five Inhabitants.      |

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

September 25th, 1825.

At a Vestry held in the Church on the above day, being the monthly vestry, the following disbursements was allowed Mr. William Aedy, the East End Overseer :—

|   |          |    |       |
|---|----------|----|-------|
| Mr. Aedy's accounts brought forward   | .. £248  | 9  | 5½    |
| Aug. 28th—Paid allowance of vestry  | .. .. .. | 0  | 5 6   |
| ,, 29th—Frankling a bill for sexton's duty, and coals<br>had for the Church, as per order of vestry | 13       | 14 | 6     |
| Relieved Harriet Collins  | .. .. .. | 0  | 4 0   |
| Sept. 2nd—Paid Mr. Perkins, as per bill   | .. .. .. | 0  | 10 10 |
| Ann Lee, four weeks   | .. .. .. | 0  | 10 0  |
| ,, 5th—Paid Mr. Legg bills for carpenter's work<br>and clerk's duty, as per order of vestry         | 24       | 16 | 11    |
| Relieved G. Baker, ill in the poorhouse   | .. .. .. | 0  | 12 0  |
| Paid for sparrows   | .. .. .. | 0  | 0 8   |
| James Robinson, ill   | .. .. .. | 0  | 1 0   |
| John Baldock, ill   | .. .. .. | 0  | 3 6   |
| ,, 21st—Paid Mr. Verrall's expenses appointing<br>churchwardens                                     | .. .. .. | 3  | 3 0   |
| Mr. Skaife for parish business  | .. .. .. | 0  | 3 0   |
| Paid Mr. Hale for the coaches had for the<br>confirmation   | .. .. .. | 4  | 8 6   |
| Mr. Anderson for coals for the poorhouse, as<br>per bill  | .. .. .. | 4  | 16 8  |
| Mr. Plowman, brieklayer's bill  | .. .. .. | 2  | 12 6  |
| Paid for clothing for Ann Taylor  | .. .. .. | 2  | 11 0  |
| Carried forward .. .. ..  | .. £307  | 3  | 0½    |

|             |   |      |    |    |
|-------------|---|------|----|----|
|             | Brought forward .. ..                                       | £307 | 3  | 0½ |
| Sept. 25th— | Soap and candles for the poorhouse ..                       | 0    | 11 | 6  |
|             | Expenses sending a casualty into Bedfordshire ..            | 0    | 10 | 6  |
|             | Relieved Wm. Dix, ill .. ..                                 | 0    | 7  | 6  |
|             | Richard Austin, ill .. ..                                   | 0    | 10 | 0  |
|             | William Wakefield, ill .. ..                                | 0    | 2  | 6  |
|             | James Smith, four weeks .. ..                               | 1    | 2  | 0  |
|             | Hepplewhite's family, four weeks .. ..                      | 1    | 7  | 6  |
|             | Wm. Howard, four weeks .. ..                                | 0    | 16 | 0  |
|             | Cross's family, four weeks .. ..                            | 1    | 10 | 0  |
|             | Elizabeth Warren, four weeks .. ..                          | 0    | 13 | 6  |
|             | Expenses going to Chelsea on account of Nix's pension .. .. | 0    | 7  | 6  |
|             | Gave W. Nix .. ..   | 0    | 1  | 0  |
|             | Paid for stamps .. ..                                       | 0    | 3  | 6  |
|             | Paid for two letters .. ..                                  | 0    | 0  | 6  |
|             | Relieved casualties .. ..                                   | 0    | 1  | 3  |
|             | Paid pensioners four weeks to September 24th, 1825 .. ..    | 33   | 14 | 0  |
|             |   | £351 | 1  | 9½ |

The following disbursements was allowed Mr. James Pope, the North End Overseer:—

|             |   |      |    |   |
|-------------|---|------|----|---|
| September — | Mr. Pope's account brought forward ..                                     | £113 | 9  | 2 |
|             | Relieved Chas. Harrow, ill .. ..  | 0    | 5  | 0 |
|             | Joseph Smith .. ..  | 0    | 3  | 0 |
|             | Mrs. Thrail, ill .. ..  | 0    | 15 | 0 |
|             | Jas. Darby's family, ill .. ..  | 2    | 8  | 0 |
|             | Relieved Mrs. Madden .. ..  | 0    | 2  | 6 |
|             | Widow Ivory's family in distress .. ..                                    | 2    | 0  | 0 |
|             | Mrs. Ball, 26 weeks from March 17th to September 17th, 1825, at 4s. .. .. | 5    | 4  | 0 |
|             | Relieved casualties .. ..   | 0    | 3  | 0 |
|             | Paid Mr. Skaief for sundry parish business ..                             | 0    | 9  | 0 |
|             | Mr. Trindall for bread had by the poor ..                                 | 1    | 3  | 8 |
|             | Mrs. Cooper, bill for clothes .. ..                                       | 1    | 8  | 7 |
|             | Mrs. Richards, as per bill .. ..  | 4    | 11 | 5 |
|             | Mr. Audsley, bill for shoes had by the poor ..                            | 22   | 2  | 8 |
|             | Paid county rates up to July 7th, 1825, as per account .. ..              | 80   | 9  | 0 |
|             | Paid pensioners four weeks to 25th of September, 1825 .. ..               | 9    | 18 | 0 |
|             |   | £244 | 12 | 0 |

Rev. Mr. WORSLEY, Chairman.

Mr. Austin applied for relief, Mr. Aedy was ordered to relieve him at discretion.

Mrs. Thrale applied for relief, her husband being very ill, Mr. Pope was ordered to give them relief.

Mrs. Ball's examination being taken, and this vestry being of opinion that her settlement is in Friern Barnet, it was ordered that she be removed thereto.

Mrs. Bowls having stated to this vestry that she wishes to go into the country to reside with her daughter, it is agreed that her pay be continued and conveyed to her.

*Ordered*—“That a printed board of regulations for the conduct of  
“the poor be made and painted and placed in a conspicuous part of  
“the poorhouse.”

"And that Mrs. Edwards be requested to attend at the next  
"monthly vestry."

*Ordered*—“ That notice be given in Church for a vestry to be held  
“ in the Church at 11 o'clock in the morning on Wednesday 12th day  
“ of October next for the purpose of making a rate for the relief of  
“ the poor and other allowable disbursements.

(Signed) REV. R. WORSLEY, *Chairman.*  
JNO. LEE,  
JOHN VERRALLS } *Churchwardens.*  
WM. AEDY,  
JAMES POPE } *Overseers.*

And seven Inhabitants.

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*October 12th, 1825.*

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, and pursuant to notice given in the Church on the two last Sundays, for the purpose of making a rate for the relief of the poor, and other allowable disbursements.

**JOHN LEE**, Churchwarden, in the Chair.

*It was ordered and agreed—“That a rate of one shilling and six-pence in the pound be made, and the same is made accordingly.”*

(Signed) JNO. LEE, *Chairman.*  
JOHN VERRALLS, *Churchwarden.*

WM. AEDY,  
JAMES POPE, } Overseers.

And four Inhabitants.

|                                  | Rental.              | Rate.              |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Amount of North End rate book .. | £4,272 15 0          | £320 9 3           |
| Amount of East End rate book ..  | 5,687 0 0            | 427 8 4            |
|                                  | <hr/><br>£9,959 15 0 | <hr/><br>£747 17 7 |

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

October 26th, 1825.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, and pursuant to notice given in the Church on the last Sunday, for the purpose of attending to the state of the poor :

Wm. Burchmore applied for relief, being lame; Mr. Pope was ordered to give him temporary relief.

Mrs. Govis was relieved with five shillings.

Mrs. Heath was ordered some clothing.

Mr. Pope was directed to give Robert Grimes some temporary relief, he being ill.

(Signed)      R. CLARIDGE, *Chairman.*  
                   WM. AEDY,      } *Overseers.*  
                   JAMES POPE,      }  
                   And six Inhabitants.

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

October 30th, 1825.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, being the monthly vestry, the following disbursements was allowed Mr. William Aedy, the East End Overseer.

|             |   |      |    |     |
|-------------|---|------|----|-----|
|             | Mr. Aedy's account brought forward ..   | £351 | 1  | 9½  |
| Sept. 25th— | Paid allowance of vestry ..   | 0    | 5  | 6   |
|             | Sarah Sharp's child to September 20th,<br>thirteen weeks at 3s. per week..  | 1    | 19 | 0   |
| ,, 28th—    | Mr. Skaffe, for Sunday parish business ..   | 0    | 6  | 0   |
|             | Mr. Wood, for meat had by the poor, as per<br>bill on Whit-Sunday ..  | 0    | 19 | 11½ |
|             | Paid a letter from Chesham, Bucks..   | 0    | 0  | 9   |
|             | A pair of shoes for William Nix ..  | 0    | 2  | 0   |
| Oct. 4th—   | Hutton, for shaving and cutting hair of the<br>poor ..  | 0    | 11 | 3   |
|             | Frost, by order of Dr. Owen, for conveying<br>a felon to prison ..  | 0    | 10 | 0   |
|             | Mr. Bean, for bread, as per bill ..   | 1    | 12 | 1   |
| ,, 7th—     | Paid at the Petty Sessions ..   | 1    | 0  | 0   |
| ,, 13th—    | Expenses taking a man to Edgware ..   | 0    | 1  | 6   |
|             | Relieved do. ..   | 0    | 2  | 0   |
|             | Paid Saint Martin's parish, for money<br>advanced to the widow Lerrad, from<br>12th of April to 25th of October,<br>twenty-eight weeks at 4s. per week .. | 5    | 12 | 0   |
| ,, 25th.—   | Conveyance by order of Dr. Owen for con-<br>veying a felon to prison ..   | 0    | 10 | 0   |
|             | Carried forward ..  | £364 | 13 | 10  |

|   | Brought forward | £  | 364 | 13 | 10 |
|---|-----------------|----|-----|----|----|
| Oct. 25th.—Paid for two poor rate books ..  | ..              | 0  | 5   | 0  |    |
| Paid for signing books .. ..  | ..              | 0  | 4   | 0  |    |
| Two trusses of straw for the poor house ..  | ..              | 0  | 2   | 6  |    |
| M <sub>r</sub> Stacy half a year's salary for attendance on the poor, due at Michlms, 1825 .. .. .. | ..              | 12 | 10  | 0  |    |
| Relieved William Brown, ill ..  | ..              | 0  | 5   | 6  |    |
| Relieved William Wakefield, ill ..  | ..              | 0  | 2   | 0  |    |
| Relieved Richard Austin, ill ..   | ..              | 0  | 16  | 0  |    |
| Paid Mrs. Edwards for casualties ..   | ..              | 1  | 3   | 0  |    |
| Relieved the widow Lerrard ..   | ..              | 0  | 3   | 6  |    |
| Paid for clothing for the poor ..   | ..              | 2  | 18  | 9  |    |
| ,, 23rd.—Paid James Smith, five weeks at 4s. ..   | ..              | 1  | 0   | 0  |    |
| Elizabeth Warren, five weeks at 4s. ..  | ..              | 1  | 0   | 0  |    |
| William Howard, five weeks at 4s. ..  | ..              | 1  | 0   | 0  |    |
| Hepplewhite's family, five weeks at 4s. ..  | ..              | 1  | 3   | 9  |    |
| Cross's family .. .. ..   | ..              | 1  | 17  | 6  |    |
| Pensioners, five weeks to October 29, 1825 ..   | 41              | 2  | 6   |    |    |
| Mrs. Govis by order of vestry .. ..   | ..              | 0  | 5   | 0  |    |
|   |                 | £  | 430 | 12 | 10 |

The following disbursements was allowed Mr. Pope, the North End Overseer:—

|         |   |    |     |     |      |
|---------|---|----|-----|-----|------|
| October | Mr. Pope's account brought forward ..                             | £  | 244 | 12  | 0    |
|         | Relieved Jas. Darby's family ill ..                               | .. | 2   | 8   | 0    |
|         | Chas. Thrale's family, ill ..                                     | .. | 2   | 0   | 0    |
|         | Mrs. Grear .. ..  | .. | 0   | 8   | 0    |
|         | Chas. Harrow, ill ..  | .. | 0   | 2   | 6    |
|         | Robert Grimes' family, ill ..                                     | .. | 1   | 9   | 0    |
|         | Mrs. Madden .. ..   | .. | 0   | 12  | 6    |
|         | Richard Smith's family, ill ..                                    | .. | 1   | 0   | 0    |
|         | Wiggins' family, ill ..   | .. | 1   | 3   | 0    |
|         | Joseph Smith .. ..  | .. | 0   | 14  | 0    |
|         | Benjamin Birchman, ill ..   | .. | 0   | 9   | 0    |
|         | George Banks ..   | .. | 0   | 8   | 0    |
|         | Thomas Weedon ..  | .. | 0   | 2   | 6    |
|         | Samuel Higgins, ill ..  | .. | 0   | 10  | 0    |
|         | Widow Heath, ill ..   | .. | 0   | 3   | 0    |
|         | Relieved casualties .. ..   | .. | 0   | 2   | 6    |
|         | Mrs. Pedlar .. ..   | .. | 0   | 2   | 6    |
|         | Surratt's family, ill ..  | .. | 0   | 10  | 0    |
|         | Fanny Schofield .. ..   | .. | 0   | 5   | 0    |
|         | John Kirby .. ..  | .. | 0   | 5   | 0    |
|         | Paid for sparrows .. ..   | .. | 0   | 0   | 7    |
|         | A shirt for James Smith .. ..                                     | .. | 0   | 3   | 9    |
|         | Orders of removal and removing Martha Ball to Friern Barnet .. .. | .. | 0   | 7   | 6    |
|         | Carried forward .. ..   | .. | £   | 256 | 18 4 |

|         |   |           |
|---------|---|-----------|
|         | Brought forward .. .. ..  | £256 18 4 |
| October | Mrs. Grigg's children, thirteen weeks, to October 11th, 1825, at 7s. per week ..  | 4 11 0    |
|         | Paid for letters and stamps .. .. ..  | 0 0 11    |
|         | Paid the overseer of Chesham, thirty-one weeks for Toovey's children, from March 25th to October the 29th, 1825, at 5s. per week .. | 7 15 0    |
|         | Paid Wm. Mathews a bill .. .. ..  | 0 11 6    |
|         | Allowance of vestry making a rate .. .. ..  | 3 3 0     |
|         | Paid pensioners four weeks to October 23rd, 1825 .. .. ..   | 9 16 0    |
|         | Paid pensioners, one week to October 30th, 1825 .. .. ..  | 2 9 0     |
|         |   | £286 4 9  |

JOHN LEE, Churchwarden, in the Chair.

*Ordered*—“That Elizabeth Hare be allowed half-a-crown per week, she being very ill.”

Mrs. Hall and Mrs. Warren's conduct having been complained of as very disorderly in the poorhouse by Mrs. Edwards, it is ordered “that they be taken before a magistrate and punished.”

Mrs. Blunt was ordered to be allowed four shillings per week.

Widow Lenard, No. 2, Shelton Court, Bedford, Bury, applied for relief, her husband lately dead, it was ordered “that she be allowed “six shillings per week for her three children.”

It was moved by Mr. Perrall and seconded by Mr. Claridge, that a notice be given in the Church for a meeting of the inhabitants to be convened on Thursday, Nov. 17th, 1825, at seven o'clock p.m. precisely, for the purpose of taking into consideration as to the privileges of the Charter granted by King John to this parish.

From the great increase of trouble and attendance of Mr. Stacy on the poor, it is ordered “that his salary be advanced to thirty-five “pounds per annum, commencing from Michaelmas last.”

(Signed)      JNO. LEE,  
                  JOHN VERRALLS,  
                  WM. AEDY,  
                  JAMES POPE,  
                  And seven Inhabitants.

#### MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*November 17th, 1825.*

At a meeting of the inhabitants on the above day, convened by public notice having been given in the Church on the two last Sundays as per order of vestry, held on the 30th of October last for the purpose of taking into consideration the privileges and benefits of a Charter granted to the inhabitants of this parish by the late King John.

It was unanimously agreed that Counsel's opinion be taken as to the privileges and benefits as described in the above Charter, and that the expense of the said opinion be paid for out of the poor rate, and that Mr. Matthews be requested to attend to the same.

Signed by twenty Inhabitants.

MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*November 23rd, 1825.*

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day and date, for the purpose of attending to the state of the poor.

Mr. LEE, Churchwarden, in the Chair.

*Ordered*—“That the Widow Schofield be allowed a pair of shoes.”  
“And that Widow Boulding be allowed two shillings per week.”

Sl. Dimbleby applied for relief. Mr. Aedy was requested to relieve him.

*Ordered*—“That William Greers' family be allowed half-a-crown “per week, and that the overseer of Hitching be requested to pay the “same.”

Henry Smith applied for work, Mr. Verrals gave him employ.

Mrs. Hutton applied for relief, her daughter being ill. Mr. Aedy was ordered to relieve her at his discretion.

(Signed)      JNO. LEE, *Chairman.*  
 JOHN VERRALLS, *Churchwarden.*  
 WM. AEDY,      } *Overseers.*  
 JAMES POPE,      }  
 And seven Inhabitants.

MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*27th November, 1825.*

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, being the monthly vestry, the following disbursements was allowed Mr. William Aedy, the East End Overseer.

|   |    |    |      |    |    |
|---|----|----|------|----|----|
| Mr. Aedy's account brought forward  | .. | .. | £430 | 12 | 10 |
| Oct. 30th—Paid allowance of vestry  | .. | .. | 0    | 5  | 6  |
| Nov. 1st—Tooley, bill for Headborough's duty                                    | .. | .. | 1    | 12 | 0  |
| “ 2nd—Paid for clothing for Sarah Slade's child                                 | .. | .. | 0    | 5  | 10 |
| James Smith, one week   | .. | .. | 0    | 4  | 0  |
| Gave William Nix  | .. | .. | 6    | 3  | 6  |
| Two and a half bushels of potatoes for the poor                                 | .. | .. | 0    | 8  | 0  |
| A flour tub for the poorhouse   | .. | .. | 0    | 3  | 6  |
| Expenses with a casual family   | .. | .. | 0    | 2  | 6  |
| “ 5th—Mrs. Edwards, for London pensioners, from July 11th to October 24th, 1825 | .. | .. | 18   | 3  | 0  |
| Carried forward   | .. | .. | £452 | 0  | 8  |

|           |  |      |    |    |
|-----------|--|------|----|----|
|           | Brought forward .. .. ..   | £452 | 0  | 8  |
| Nov. 5th— | Mrs. Farrer's pension, thirty-six weeks at<br>2s. 6d. per week, up to November 7th,<br>1825 .. .. .. | 4    | 10 | 0  |
|           | Paid land-tax for the poorhouse to Michael-<br>mas, 1825 .. .. ..                                    | 0    | 15 | 7½ |
|           | Mrs. Edwards, for a casualty .. .. ..  | 0    | 16 | 0  |
|           | Paid for letters .. .. ..  | 0    | 1  | 3  |
|           | Mr. Skief for parish business .. .. ..   | 0    | 14 | 0  |
| ,, 21st—  | Paid for sparrows .. .. ..   | 0    | 1  | 3  |
|           | Relieved William Greer's family .. .. ..   | 0    | 7  | 6  |
|           | Relieved Samuel Puddyfoot's family, ill .. .. ..   | 0    | 8  | 6  |
|           | Elizabeth Aedy .. .. ..  | 0    | 2  | 6  |
| ,, 24th—  | Samuel Dimbleby .. .. ..   | 0    | 2  | 6  |
|           | William Howard, four weeks .. .. ..  | 0    | 16 | 0  |
|           | E. Warren, four weeks .. .. ..   | 0    | 16 | 0  |
|           | Josh. Cross's family, four weeks .. .. ..  | 1    | 10 | 0  |
|           | Hepplewhite's family, four weeks .. .. ..  | 0    | 19 | 0  |
|           | Pensioners, four weeks to Nov. 26th, 1825  | 32   | 18 | 0  |
|           |  | £496 | 18 | 3½ |

The following disbursements was allowed Mr. James Pope, the North End Overseer.

|  |      |    |   |
|--|------|----|---|
| Mr. Pope's account brought forward .. .. ..              | £286 | 4  | 9 |
| November — Relieved R. Grimes' family, four weeks ..     | 0    | 8  | 0 |
| Do. Darby's family, four weeks ..                        | 2    | 8  | 0 |
| Do. James Williss, four weeks ..                         | 0    | 15 | 0 |
| Do. James Lines, four weeks, ill ..                      | 0    | 7  | 6 |
| Do. Fanny Schofield .. .. ..                             | 0    | 7  | 6 |
| Do. Charles Thrail's family, four weeks,<br>ill .. .. .. | 0    | 10 | 0 |
| Do. Samuel Higgins, four weeks, ill ..                   | 0    | 15 | 0 |
| Do. Mrs. Pedlar .. .. ..                                 | 0    | 2  | 6 |
| Do. Richard Smith's family, four weeks,<br>ill .. .. ..  | 1    | 0  | 0 |
| Do. Thomas Clark, ill .. .. ..                           | 0    | 10 | 0 |
| Do. Wiggins' Family .. .. ..                             | 1    | 0  | 0 |
| Do. James Surratt, ill .. .. ..                          | 0    | 10 | 0 |
| Do. Mrs. Jarvis, ill .. .. ..                            | 0    | 16 | 0 |
| Do. William Bedford, ill .. .. ..                        | 0    | 2  | 6 |
| Do. John Kirby, ill .. .. ..                             | 1    | 15 | 0 |
| Do. a poor man .. .. ..                                  | 0    | 5  | 0 |
| Do. G. Banks' family, ill .. .. ..                       | 0    | 5  | 0 |
| Paid Mrs. Cooper, as per bill .. .. ..                   | 0    | 3  | 9 |
| Relieved casualties .. .. ..                             | 0    | 2  | 6 |
| Paid Mr. Audsley, bill for parish business               | 1    | 15 | 0 |
| Carried forward .. .. ..                                 | £300 | 3  | 0 |

|   |                    |      |   |   |
|---|--------------------|------|---|---|
|   | Brought forward .. | £300 | 3 | 0 |
| November — Relieved Charles Harrow ..   | 0                  | 5    | 0 |   |
| Paid for orders of removal for Thomas Weedon ..   | 0                  | 3    | 6 |   |
| Removing Thomas Weedon and two children to Totteridge ..                                      | 0                  | 7    | 0 |   |
| Orders of removal for James Smith ..  | 0                  | 3    | 6 |   |
| Removing James Smith to Hampstead ..  | 0                  | 6    | 0 |   |
| Orders of removal for James Lines ..  | 0                  | 3    | 6 |   |
| Removing James Lines and wife to Kingsbury ..   | 0                  | 7    | 6 |   |
| Mr. Skafe, for magistrates' business ..   | 0                  | 8    | 0 |   |
| Paid for letters and stamps ..  | 0                  | 2    | 1 |   |
| Mr. Matthews, bill for two appeals at the Sessions, and other business ..                     | 25                 | 5    | 6 |   |
| Mr. Taff, a bill for refreshments had by persons perambulating the parish on Holy Thursday .. | 0                  | 16   | 6 |   |
| Paid pensioners, four weeks, to 27th of Nov., 1825 ..   | 10                 | 14   | 0 |   |
|   | £339               | 5    | 1 |   |

Revd. Mr. WORSLEY, in the Chair.

*Ordered*—“That the resolution made on the 17th of November “with respect to the Charter be confirmed by this vestry.”

Mr. Verrals having presented certain resolutions respecting the conduct of the poor, it is ordered that the same be painted on a board and put up in a conspicuous part of the poorhouse, and that the said resolutions be entered in this book.

Certain resolutions respecting the poorhouse having been laid before this vestry, it is ordered that the vestry clerk wait on Mrs. Chilver with the same, and that the same be taken into consideration at the next monthly vestry.

*Ordered*—“That Frost's constables bill be paid, amount £10 19s. 0d.”

*Ordered*—“That Mr. Parrott be allowed a pair of shoes.”

(Signed) RALPH WORSLEY, *Chairman.*  
JOHN VERRALLS, *Churchwarden.*  
WM. AEDY, } *Overseers.*  
JAMES POPE, }  
And nine Inhabitants.

---

#### FINCHLEY POORHOUSE RULES AND REGULATIONS TO BE OBSERVED IN THIS HOUSE.

The master and mistress are desired to attend to the following regulations and instructions:—

1st. That the house is kept perfectly clean by the persons who are able to keep it so.

2nd. That good order and sobriety be preserved by all persons inhabiting therein.

3rd. It is desired every person, who is able, to attend Divine Service every Sunday and appear there clean and decent.

4th. That no person under any pretence whatsoever remain out at night after seven o'clock from Michaelmas to Lady Day, and eight o'clock from Lady Day to Michaelmas, or absent themselves without leave.

Any persons offending against the rules above prescribed, by information given to the parish officers, will be immediately punished as the law directs, by order of vestry.

(Signed) JOHN LEE,  
JOHN VERRALLS, } *Churchwardens.*  
WILLIAM AEDY, } *Overseers.*  
JAMES POPE,

### MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

December 7th, 1825.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, and pursuant to notice given in the Church on the two last Sundays, for the purpose of auditing and passing the accounts of the surveyors of the highways for the last year.

JOHN VERRALLS, Churchwarden, in the Chair.

Mr. John Laman, Surveyor for the East End, his account stands as under:—

|                        |    |    |    |      |    |    |
|------------------------|----|----|----|------|----|----|
| Expended..             | .. | .. | .. | £251 | 13 | 3½ |
| Received ..            | .. | .. | .. | 248  | 18 | 6½ |
|                        |    |    |    |      |    |    |
| Due to the surveyor .. |    |    |    | £2   | 14 | 9  |

Mr. Moses Taylor, Surveyor for the North End, his account stands as under:

|                        |    |    |    |      |    |    |
|------------------------|----|----|----|------|----|----|
| Expended..             | .. | .. | .. | £178 | 4  | 6½ |
| Received ..            | .. | .. | .. | 177  | 17 | 2½ |
|                        |    |    |    |      |    |    |
| Due to the surveyor .. |    |    |    | £0   | 7  | 4  |

(Signed) JOHN VERRALLS, *Chairman.*  
JNO. LEE, *Churchwarden.*  
WM. AEDY, *Overseer.*  
And five Inhabitants.

### MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

Deeember 21st, 1825.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, for the purpose of attending to the state of the poor.

Mr. LEE, the Churchwarden, in the Chair.

Mrs. Dowsett applied for relief, her husband late dead, having four children, it was agreed to allow her 8s. per week.

Mrs. Prickett applied for relief, she was ordered to receive 2s. 6d. per week.

Thomas Wilden was ordered a pair of shoes.

William Tuchbery applied for relief, he was ordered 2s. 6d. a week.

Mr. Austin applied for work, Mr. Taylor gave him employ.

Henry Smith out of employ, Mr. Jaques gave him work.

John Smith applied for work, he was recommended to Mr. Russell for employ.

Robert Grimes applied for work, Mr. Jaques gave him employ.

Mrs. Edmonds applied for relief, her husband being in prison, Mr. Aedy was ordered to give her some present relief.

Application was made on account of Mrs. Elliott, it was agreed to allow her 4s. per week.

(Signed) JOHN LEE, *Chairman.*

JOHN VERRALLS, *Churchwarden.*

WILLIAM AEDY }  
JAMES POPE, } *Overseers.*

And nine Inhabitants.

### MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*December 25th, 1825.*

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, being the monthly vestry, the following disbursements was allowed Mr. William Aedy, the East End Overseer :—

|                 |  |               |
|-----------------|--|---------------|
| Nov. 28th       | Mr. Aedy's account, brought forward      | .. £496 18 3½ |
|                 | Paid allowance of Vestry .. ..           | .. 0 5 6      |
|                 | Paid for the killing a mad dog .. ..     | .. 0 2 6      |
| ,, 29th.        | Relieved William Brown, ill ..           | . 0 5 9       |
|                 | To fetching Lucy Hoare from London ..    | 0 10 0        |
| Dec. 5th.—      | Mrs. Edwards, for William Howard ..      | 0 8 0         |
| ,, 14th.—       | Paid Frost bill for constables duty ..   | 10 19 0       |
|                 | Relieved Mrs. Hutton .. ..               | 0 3 0         |
| ,, 16th.—       | Mrs. Edwards for casualties ..           | 0 2 6         |
| ,, 18th.—       | Paid for a polecat .. ..                 | 0 0 8         |
|                 | Paid for sparrows .. ..                  | 0 0 3         |
|                 | Paid for two letters .. ..               | 0 0 6         |
|                 | Mrs. Edwards, for Lucy Hoare ..          | 0 16 0        |
|                 | Mrs. Edwards, for Jane Eastwell ..       | 0 3 0         |
|                 | Relieved casualties .. ..                | 0 2 10        |
|                 | Relieved Widow Dowsett and four children | 0 10 0        |
| Carried forward |  | £511 7 0½     |

|             |   |    |    |    |      |    |    |
|-------------|---|----|----|----|------|----|----|
|             | Brought forward..                                       | .. | .. | .. | £511 | 7  | 0½ |
| Dec. 18th.— | Relieved Widow Hallett                                  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 10 | 0  |
|             | Samuel Dimbleby   | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 10 | 0  |
|             | Richard Austin  | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 15 | 0  |
|             | Samuel Puddyfoot's family                               | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 10 | 0  |
|             | Widow Boulding, four weeks                              | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 8  | 0  |
| ,, 22nd.—   | Mrs. Edmonds ..   | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 2  | 6  |
|             | Jane Eastwell, two weeks                                | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 7  | 0  |
| ,, 24th.—   | Hepplewhite's family, four weeks                        | .. | .. | .. | 0    | 19 | 0  |
|             | Josh. Cross's family, four weeks                        | .. | .. | .. | 1    | 10 | 0  |
|             | Paid pensioners, four weeks to December<br>24th, 1825.. | .. | .. | .. | 31   | 10 | 0  |
|             |   |    |    |    | £548 | 8  | 6½ |

The following disbursements was allowed Mr. James Pope, the North End Overseer :—

|      |  |    |      |    |   |
|------|--|----|------|----|---|
| Dec. | Mr. Pope's account brought forward   | .. | £339 | 5  | 1 |
|      | Relieved Jas. Williss' family, ill four weeks  | .. | 1    | 0  | 0 |
|      | Joseph Smith's family, ill four weeks  | .. | 0    | 10 | 6 |
|      | Chas. Harrow ..  | .. | 0    | 5  | 0 |
|      | Darby's family, ill four weeks   | .. | 2    | 8  | 0 |
|      | Wiggins' family, ill four weeks  | .. | 1    | 0  | 0 |
|      | Fanny Schofield ..   | .. | 0    | 10 | 0 |
|      | William Bedford, ill ..  | .. | 0    | 5  | 0 |
|      | William Breed, ill ..  | .. | 0    | 6  | 0 |
|      | James Arnold ..  | .. | 0    | 8  | 0 |
|      | Richard Smith's family, ill ..   | .. | 1    | 0  | 0 |
|      | Robert Grimes' family, ill ..  | .. | 1    | 2  | 0 |
|      | Thos. Clark, ill ..  | .. | 0    | 5  | 0 |
|      | Mrs. Eastwell ..   | .. | 0    | 3  | 0 |
|      | George Banks ..  | .. | 0    | 5  | 0 |
|      | Thomas Clark's club ..   | .. | 0    | 10 | 6 |
|      | John Kirby, four weeks ..  | .. | 1    | 5  | 0 |
|      | Relieved casualties ..   | .. | 0    | 3  | 0 |
|      | Mrs. Simmonds' bill for bread had by the<br>poor ..  | .. | 1    | 19 | 6 |
|      | Removing John Grange to Hemmel Hemp-<br>stead, Hertfordshire, seventeen miles<br>at 1/6 .. | .. | 1    | 5  | 6 |
|      | Pensioners, four weeks to December 25th,<br>1825 ..  | .. | 11   | 0  | 0 |
|      |  |    | £364 | 16 | 1 |

JOHN LEE, Churchwarden, in the Chair.

This vestry was adjourned to the "Queen's head," being Sacrament Sunday.

The report of the officers who met at the poorhouse on the 23rd day of November last being taken into consideration—"It is ordered "that that the same be entered in this book, and that all the articles "mentioned therein be provided by the overseers."

*Ordered*—"That Mrs. Warring be allowed some clothing, and "that Mr. Pope provide the same."

(Signed) JNO. LEE, *Chairman.*  
JOHN VERRALLS, *Churchwarden.*  
WILLM. AEDY,  
JAMES POPE, } *Overseers.*

#### PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

At a meeting of the churchwardens and overseers at the poor-house on the 23rd day of November, 1825, for the purpose of inspecting the same. And likewise to hear any complaints which the poor had to make as to their living, and other comforts.

Mrs. Edwards, mistress of the poorhouse being applied to, made the following statement of bedding, &c., in the house, viz:—

Four sheets, two pair quite new, the others good; ten rugs, three quite new, the others good; twelve bedsteads, ten good, two middling, eight of which are 4 ft. 4 ins. wide, and large enough for two persons to sleep in comfortably, two smaller ones which are kept for persons who may be ill and require a bed to themselves, are 3 ft. 3 ins. wide, the other two are kept for casualties who come into the poorhouse in an unclean state.

Eleven beds, some feather and some flock, four of which want new ticks, the others good.

After receiving the above report we proceeded to examine every article as above described, and found them to be quite as good as described by Mrs. Edwards, and in a clean and comfortable state, and we likewise found the house in a perfect state of cleanliness from top to bottom.

We next examined the female paupers as to any complaints they might have to make (not in the presence of the mistress) as to the sufficiency of their pay to their necessities, and they all agreed with their present allowance; they can live comfortably and don't wish for any alteration.

The men were next heard, and they each made the same declaration, excepting in the allowance of firing, being only allowed a peck of coals for a day, and they wish to be allowed half a bushel in the cold weather, *which we recommended.*

#### Females in the Poorhouse :

|                | Age.     |
|----------------|----------|
| Widow Heath    | 80 years |
| Martha Hall    | 72 ,,    |
| Widow Claridge | 79 ,,    |
| Mrs. White     | 63 ,,    |
| Mrs. Warren    | 50 ,,    |
| Fanny Brown    | 2 ,,     |

#### Males in the Poorhouse :

|              | Age.     |
|--------------|----------|
| John Brown   | 66 years |
| James Murray | 67 ,,    |
| Wm. Nix      | 37 ,,    |
| Thos. Nix    | 70 ,,    |
| Wm. Gaywood  | 14 ,,    |
| Wm. Howard   |          |

Richd. Austin and wife and child, temporary.

Mrs. Edwards said that a pewter bedpan is very much wanted, and a pewter water bottle, and three and a half yards of stout ticking for the purpose of making a strait waistcoat, and some coarse tape to bind the same, and as much ticking as will suffice for the four beds before mentioned, and she will get them made by the women in the house. She likewise wants a frying pan for their use, and we recommend that a half bushel measure be provided, and that the poor have their coals measured to them every morning therewith.

And we, on inspecting the end of the house to the southward, find that the rain beating against the brickwork causes a damp to be in two of the bed rooms next that end of the house, and we recommend, to prevent the same, that the brickwork be compoed down to the lean-to, and that the lean-to be tarred to preserve the boards and resist the wet and damps, and likewise think the inside of the house should be white-washed.

(Signed) JOHN LEE, *Churchwarden.*  
 WM. AEDY, } *Overseers.*  
 JAMES POPE, }  
 J. E. STACY, *Surgeon.*  
 THOS. AUDSLEY, *Vestry Clerk.*

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY,

January 25th, 1826.

At a vestry, held in the Church, on the above day, for the purpose of attending to the state of the poor.

Mr. J. VERRALLS, Churchwarden in the Chair.

*Ordered*—“That Thos. Wattle be allowed three shillings per week.”

Saml. Crump was allowed one shilling and sixpence.

Mr. Tuchberry was ordered a pair of small clothes.

*Ordered*—“That Wm. Woodward be allowed one shoe for his lame foot.”

(Signed) JOHN VERRALLS, *Chairman.*  
 WM. AEDY, } *Overseers.*  
 JAMES POPE, }  
 And six Inhabitants.

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

January 29th, 1826.

At a vestry, held in the Church, on the above day, being the monthly vestry, the following disbursements was allowed Mr. William Aedy, the East End Overseer:—

|   |    |     |     |      |
|---|----|-----|-----|------|
| Dec. 25th—Paid allowance of vestry .. .. .. ..      | £  | 548 | 8   | 6½   |
| ,, 26th—Paid for soap and candles had at poorhouse, | .. | 0   | 5   | 6    |
| 14 weeks .. .. .. ..                                | .. | 1   | 10  | 7    |
| Carried forward .. .. .. ..                         | .. | £   | 550 | 4 7½ |

|  |                    |      |    |    |
|--|--------------------|------|----|----|
|  | Brought forward .. | £550 | 4  | 7½ |
| Dec. 27th—Plums and currants at poorhouse on<br>Christmas day ..               | ..                 | 0    | 3  | 11 |
| Paid Sarah Sharp's child, 13 weeks to<br>Deer. 20th, 1825, at 3s. per week. .. | ..                 | 1    | 19 | 0  |
| <b>1826</b>  |                    |      |    |    |
| Jany. 1st.—Paid for a pair of trousers for J. Brown ..                         | ..                 | 0    | 5  | 0  |
| Hutton, for barbering the poor ..  | ..                 | 0    | 17 | 3  |
| Burton, for sweeping vestry room chimney ..                                    | ..                 | 0    | 2  | 6  |
| ,, 9th—Frying pan and kettle for the poorhouse ..                              | ..                 | 0    | 12 | 6  |
| Paid for sparrows ..   | ..                 | 0    | 1  | 3  |
| Paid for a polecat ..  | ..                 | 0    | 0  | 8  |
| Relieved casualties ..   | ..                 | 0    | 1  | 10 |
| A boy in the poorhouse 4 weeks ..  | ..                 | 0    | 16 | 0  |
| Paid for letters ..  | ..                 | 0    | 0  | 9  |
| Relieved Richd. Howard ..  | ..                 | 0    | 3  | 6  |
| Wakefield's family ..  | ..                 | 0    | 4  | 0  |
| Batchelor's family ..  | ..                 | 0    | 2  | 6  |
| Edmund's family, 5 weeks ..  | ..                 | 1    | 5  | 0  |
| Richd. Austin ..   | ..                 | 1    | 7  | 6  |
| Elizth. Aedy ..  | ..                 | 0    | 14 | 6  |
| John Shepherd, out of employ ..  | ..                 | 0    | 6  | 0  |
| John Baldoek, jun. ..  | ..                 | 0    | 2  | 6  |
| John Baldoek, sen. ..  | ..                 | 0    | 2  | 0  |
| Saml. Crump, ill ..  | ..                 | 0    | 10 | 6  |
| Thos. Wattel ..  | ..                 | 0    | 6  | 6  |
| Mrs. Shepherd, for a casual child ..   | ..                 | 0    | 18 | 6  |
| Relieved John Smith ..   | ..                 | 0    | 1  | 6  |
| Cross's family, five weeks ..  | ..                 | 1    | 17 | 6  |
| Hepplewhite's, five weeks ..   | ..                 | 1    | 3  | 9  |
| Pensioner's, five weeks ..   | ..                 | 44   | 4  | 0  |
|  |                    | £608 | 15 | 0½ |

The following disbursements was allowed Mr. Pope, the North End Overseer:—

|          |   |      |      |    |   |
|----------|---|------|------|----|---|
| 1826.    | Mr. Pope's account brought forward ..               | £364 | 16   | 1  |   |
| January— | Relieved Thos. Wilden's family, out of<br>employ .. | ..   | 1    | 10 | 6 |
|          | Darby's family, ill, five weeks ..                  | ..   | 2    | 14 | 0 |
|          | Wiggins' family, ill, five weeks ..                 | ..   | 1    | 10 | 0 |
|          | Richd. Smith, ill, five weeks ..                    | ..   | 1    | 5  | 0 |
|          | Chas. Harrow ..                                     | ..   | 0    | 5  | 0 |
|          | Fanny Schoffield ..                                 | ..   | 0    | 10 | 0 |
|          | Mrs. Grear ..                                       | ..   | 0    | 4  | 0 |
|          | Mr. Eastwell, ill ..                                | ..   | 0    | 4  | 0 |
|          | Joseph Smith, out of employ ..                      | ..   | 0    | 18 | 6 |
|          | Hugh Jordon, ill ..                                 | ..   | 0    | 6  | 0 |
|          | Carried forward ..                                  | ..   | £374 | 3  | 1 |

|  | Brought forward | .. | £374 | 3  | 1 |
|--|-----------------|----|------|----|---|
| John Harris, out of employ                   | ..              | .. | 0    | 9  | 0 |
| G. Banks' club..                             | ..              | .. | 0    | 6  | 0 |
| Relieved G. Banks                            | ..              | .. | 0    | 4  | 0 |
| Mrs. Warren ..                               | ..              | .. | 0    | 5  | 0 |
| Richard Howard ..                            | ..              | .. | 0    | 2  | 6 |
| Thos. Newcomb's club                         | ..              | .. | 0    | 9  | 0 |
| Relieved Mr. Freeman, out of employ          | ..              | .. | 0    | 12 | 6 |
| Mrs. Jordon, to bury her child               | ..              | .. | 0    | 12 | 6 |
| James Lines, five weeks                      | ..              | .. | 1    | 10 | 0 |
| James Clark ..                               | ..              | .. | 0    | 2  | 0 |
| Wm. Breed, ill ..                            | ..              | .. | 0    | 6  | 0 |
| Thos. Clark ..                               | ..              | .. | 0    | 2  | 0 |
| Richd. Smith, sen., ill ..                   | ..              | .. | 0    | 2  | 6 |
| Relieved casualties ..                       | ..              | .. | 0    | 2  | 6 |
| Paid for letters ..                          | ..              | .. | 0    | 2  | 4 |
| Mrs. Cooper per bill ..                      | ..              | .. | 0    | 1  | 5 |
| Mr. Trindal, bill for rolls ..               | ..              | .. | 1    | 8  | 0 |
| Mr. Trindall, bill for bread had by the poor | ..              | .. | 2    | 6  | 6 |
| Mrs. Richards, as per bill ..                | ..              | .. | 2    | 6  | 2 |
| Mrs. Jarvis, ill ..                          | ..              | .. | 1    | 0  | 0 |
| Pensioners, five weeks to January 29, 1826   | ..              | .. | 13   | 17 | 6 |
|  |                 |    | £400 | 11 | 6 |

John Jordan's wife applied for relief, family being ill, was relieved with 5s.

*Ordered*—“That the following bills be paid:—Mr. Audsley, R. “Legg’s, D. James’s, Willm. Ing, M. Plowmans, J. Leamans, “Franklin.”

(Signed)      REVD. RALPH WORSLEY, *in the Chair.*  
                   JOHN VERRALLS, *Churchwarden.*  
                   WM. AEDY, *Overseer.*  
                   And nine Inhabitants.

#### MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

February 22nd, 1826.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, for the purpose of attending to the state of the poor.

Mr. ROBERT CLARIDGE in the Chair.

Thomas Waddle’s pay was advanced to four shillings per week.

Mrs. Wiggins applied for her husband being very ill. She was ordered to have ten shillings per week for the present.

*Ordered*—“That William Barker be allowed a pair of shoes; “Samuel Dimbleby out of employ, was ordered some temporary relief.”

Hepplewhite was ordered a desk and forms, he wishing to commence a day school.

(Signed)      R. CLARIDGE, *Chairman.*  
                   WM. AEDY,  
                   JAMES POPE, } *Overseers.*  
                   And five Inhabitants.

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

February 26th, 1826.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day and date, being the monthly vestry, the following disbursements was allowed Mr. William Aedy, the East End Overseer :—

|      |      |  |    |     |    |    |
|------|------|--|----|-----|----|----|
|      |      | Mr. Aedy's account brought forward..   | £  | 608 | 15 | 0½ |
| Jan. | 29th | Paid allowance of vestry ..  | 0  | 5   | 6  |    |
|      |      | Franklin, bill for sexton's duty ..  | 9  | 18  | 6  |    |
| Feb. |      | Relieved Joseph Goby, ill ..   | 0  | 2   | 6  |    |
| ,,   | 2nd  | Mrs. I. Burton for her child's funeral ..  | 0  | 12  | 6  |    |
|      |      | Mr. Laman as per bill ..   | 7  | 1   | 2  |    |
|      |      | Paid toward the funeral of John Harris ..  | 1  | 0   | 0  |    |
| Feb. | 5th  | Relieved Mrs. Toovey's children ..   | 0  | 10  | 0  |    |
| ,,   | 6th  | Paid for clothes for the poor ..   | 0  | 15  | 8  |    |
| ,,   | 8th  | Mr. James, bill for smith work ..  | 3  | 7   | 8  |    |
|      |      | Mr. Scaiff for magistrate's business ..  | 0  | 9   | 0  |    |
|      |      | A bedstead for Mrs. Smith ..   | 1  | 5   | 0  |    |
| ,,   | 11th | Mrs. Shepherd, for Susanna Rayner ..   | 0  | 8   | 0  |    |
|      |      | Joseph Harden, a casualty in the poorhouse                                       | 0  | 6   | 6  |    |
|      |      | Relieved Edmonds's family ..   | 0  | 5   | 0  |    |
| ,,   | 13th | Wm. Bacholer, out of employ ..   | 0  | 4   | 0  |    |
|      |      | John Smith, out of employ ..   | 0  | 1   | 0  |    |
| ,,   | 15th | Blankets, sheets, &c., for the poorhouse ..                                      | 4  | 8   | 6  |    |
| ,,   | 20th | Gave Mrs. White ..   | 0  | 2   | 6  |    |
| ,,   | 21st | Mr. Edwards for London pensioners up to<br>January 24th, 1826, as per account .. | 23 | 4   | 0  |    |
|      |      | Relieved Richd. Austen ..  | 10 | 0   | 0  |    |
|      |      | Joseph Bacholer, ill ..  | 0  | 15  | 0  |    |
|      |      | Wm. Wakefield, out of employ ..  | 0  | 13  | 0  |    |
|      |      | Mrs. Wm. Burton ..   | 0  | 2   | 6  |    |
|      |      | Saml. Crump, out of employ ..  | 0  | 10  | 6  |    |
|      |      | Paid for a hedgehog ..   | 0  | 0   | 4  |    |
|      |      | Paid for letters ..  | 0  | 2   | 7  |    |
|      |      | Relieved Saml. Dimbleby ..   | 0  | 4   | 6  |    |
|      |      | Relieved casualties ..   | 0  | 1   | 3  |    |
| ,,   | 25th | Paid Audsley, bill for shoes ..  | 8  | 15  | 1  |    |
|      |      | Removing Susanna Reyner to Saint Giles ..  | 0  | 10  | 0  |    |
|      |      | Thos. Wattle, four weeks ..  | 0  | 12  | 0  |    |
|      |      | Widow Boulding, four weeks ..  | 0  | 16  | 0  |    |
|      |      | Elizth. Aedy, four weeks ..  | 0  | 16  | 0  |    |
|      |      | Jane Eastwell, nine weeks ..   | 1  | 16  | 0  |    |
|      |      | Josh. Cross's family, four weeks ..  | 1  | 10  | 0  |    |
|      |      | Hepplewhite's family, four weeks ..  | 1  | 8   | 0  |    |
|      |      | John Baldock, labour on the road ..  | 0  | 4   | 0  |    |
|      |      | Paid pensioners, four weeks, to February<br>25th, 1826 ..                        | 33 | 16  | 0  |    |
|      |      |  | £  | 716 | 4  | 9½ |

The following disbursements was allowed Mr. James Pope, the North End Overseer:—

|      |   |      |    |    |
|------|---|------|----|----|
|      | Mr. Pope's account brought forward..                                    | £400 | 11 | 6  |
| Feb. | Relieved Mrs. Jordan .. .. ..   | 0    | 5  | 0  |
|      | Darby's family, ill .. .. ..  | 1    | 16 | 0  |
|      | James Lines, four weeks .. .. ..  | 1    | 4  | 0  |
|      | Mrs. Warren .. .. ..  | 0    | 5  | 6  |
|      | John Kirby, nine weeks .. .. ..   | 2    | 5  | 0  |
|      | Riehd. Smith's family, four weeks .. .. ..                              | 1    | 0  | 0  |
|      | Wiggins's family, ill, four weeks .. .. ..                              | 2    | 0  | 0  |
|      | Thos. Wilden's family, ill, four weeks .. .. ..                         | 0    | 7  | 0  |
|      | Hugh Jordan, ill .. .. ..   | 0    | 5  | 0  |
|      | Willm. Briers, ill .. .. ..   | 0    | 5  | 6  |
|      | Thomas Plumer, ill .. .. ..   | 0    | 5  | 0  |
|      | Robt. Grimes' family, nine weeks .. .. ..                               | 1    | 19 | 6  |
|      | John Perkins, ill .. .. ..  | 0    | 15 | 0  |
|      | R. Ford, ill .. .. ..   | 0    | 4  | 0  |
|      | Joseph Smith .. .. ..   | 0    | 2  | 0  |
|      | Casualties .. .. ..   | 0    | 2  | 0  |
|      | A pair of small cloth for Mr. Tuchbery .. .. ..                         | 0    | 8  | 0  |
|      | Paid for a hedgehog .. .. ..  | 0    | 0  | 4  |
|      | Wm. Ing, constables' bill .. .. ..                                      | 5    | 2  | 0  |
|      | Paper for the use of parish, as per bill .. .. ..                       | 0    | 10 | 11 |
|      | Orders of removal for Susanh. Reyner .. .. ..                           | 0    | 3  | 6  |
|      | Orders for Thos. Harding .. .. ..                                       | 0    | 3  | 6  |
|      | Removing Thos. Harding to Chatham, 39 miles at 1s 6d. per mile .. .. .. | 2    | 18 | 6  |
|      | Paid for three letters.. .. ..  | 0    | 0  | 9  |
|      | Mrs. Gregg's children, 17 weeks, up to January 30th, 1826 .. .. ..      | 5    | 19 | 0  |
|      | Relieved Mary Ayers, ill .. .. ..                                       | 1    | 10 | 0  |
|      | Mr. Legg, bill for carpenter's work .. .. ..                            | 28   | 10 | 7  |
|      | Paid Mr. Legg, clerks' duty .. .. ..                                    | 14   | 17 | 0  |
|      | Pensioners, four weeks to 26th of February, 1826 .. .. ..               | 11   | 10 | 0  |
|      |   | £485 | 6  | 1  |

Revd. Mr. WORSLEY in the chair.

*Ordered*—“ That Mrs. Toovey's children's pay be advanced to seven shillings and sixpence per week.”

“ And that Mr. Wilkinson's constables' bill be paid, £5 5s. 3d.”

“ And that £2 3s. be allowed to the officers of St. Leonard's, Leicester, for money advanced to Merrill's family, and likewise £1 “ for medical attendance.”

“ And that the case and opinion of counsel respecting the Charter “ be entered in this book.”

"And that six pair of sheets be provided for the use of the poor-house ; and that Mrs. Heath, Elizth. White, and Sarah Claridge be allowed a gown and apron each."

"And that Mr. Schofield be compelled to pay the poor rate."

Mrs. J. Burton was ordered 5s.

Wm. Burton was relieved with 5s.

(Signed)      RALPH WORSLEY, *Chairman.*  
And nine Inhabitants.

---

CASE FOR THE OPINION OF MR. TINDAL, RESPECTING THE  
CHARTER GRANTED TO THE PARISH OF FINCHLEY BY KING JOHN.

The inhabitants of the parish of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex, have for many years past considered themselves entitled to an exemption from the payment of tolls and exactions on all fairs and markets throughout the Kingdom under a charter of King John, confirmed by Queen Elizabeth and Charles the First, which latter Charter is now preserved amongst the records in the vestry of the Church at Finchley.

A translation of which Charter is as follows :—

Charles, by the Grace of God, of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, and so forth. To all and singular our justices, sheriffs, escheators, mayors, coroners, headboroughs, ministers, bailiffs, constables, provisors, foresters, verdurers, stewards, regarders, and all other His Majesty's subjects whatsoever, as well within liberties as without, to whom these presents shall come greeting. Whereas Lord John, late King of England, our progenitor by his Charter bearing date at Shoreham, the 16th day of June in the first year of his reign, which Lady Elizabeth, late Queen of England, confirmed the 10th day of February in the second year of her reign, amongst other things granted to God and to the Church of Saint Paul, London, and to William, then Bishop thereof, and his successors, all his lands and possessions and tenements free and clear for ever from all exactions. With all their free customs throughout our whole land, and that they and their men might be free from toll and pontage and passage and payage and lestage and stallage and carriage and tallage and package, and every other custom throughout our whole land, of all the goods that they should carry by land or by water. And the said late king forbid that nobody should trouble or vex them or their goods or possessions or men against the liberty of the Charter aforesaid, upon forfeiture of him, the late king. Therefore we command you, and every of you, that you permit the men and tenants of the Reverend Father in Christ, George, now Bishop of London, within his demesne or village of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex, residing, to have and exercise to them, and every of them, to use and enjoy all the liberties, quittances, and privileges in form aforesaid specified, according to the tenor of the Charter and confirmation aforesaid, not molesting or anywise aggrieving them or their men, or any of them, contrary to the tenor of the same.

In testimony whereof we have caused these our letters to be made patents. Witness ourself at Westminster, the seventh day of April in the third year of our reign.

The living of Finchley is a rectory, and in the gift of the Bishop of London.

Some part of the lands within the parish are freehold; other, and a very considerable part, is copyhold, held of the manor of the said Bishop; other part, which might formerly be esteemed to be his demesne lands, are now held of the Bishop under leases for lives, and a small part of the parish is within the Manor of Bibsworth, over which the Bishop's manor is paramount.

The farmers who carry their hay to Smithfield, claim under these Charters the privilege from exemption of paying toll on coming into the city of London, which is generally acquiesced in, and such exemptions have been claimed at various fairs and markets in other parts of the Kingdom, at some of which it has been allowed, and at others refused.

A new toll gate, under the Whetstone Turnpike Trust, has been recently erected, which has occasioned much dissatisfaction amongst the farmers and other inhabitants; and they are, therefore, desirous of knowing the extent of their privileges under such Charter.

By the words scored under in the above translation of the Charter of King Charles, the privilege seems to be limited to the men and tenants of the Bishop, within his demesne or village of Finchley.

Your opinion is requested as to the nature and extent of such exemptions from the payment of any and what tolls and at any and what places, and whether the privilege is extended to the whole of the inhabitants and resident freeholders, copyholders, and leaseholders under the Bishop or their occupants within the parish of Finchley, or to any and which of them in particular, as it is the wish of the inhabitants to have their rights clearly defined and understood.

It is presumed no exemption can be claimed against the payment of tolls at turnpikes erected under the authority of Parliament, either in or out of the parish, although some persons in the parish have an idea that the Charters exempt them from the payment of such tolls within the parish.

#### OPINION.

I think the exemption created by the grant from the Crown extends to all the freeholders and copyholders of the manor whereof the Bishop is lord, residing within the manor, and also to all the lessees of the demesne lands of the Bishop residing within the manor, and to the tenants and occupiers of such freeholders, copyholders and leaseholders, where the lands are not occupied by the parties themselves. The grant specifies that the Bishops and their men might be free from toll, by which would be understood the freemen or freeholders of the manor, but the copyholders who hold under grants from former lords of the manor of such parcels of land as formerly constituted part of the demesnes, would, as I conceive, be entitled to this exemption under that part of the grant which confers it upon

the Bishop and his men within his demesne or village of Finchley—the same construction being put upon the right of exemption which is claimed at common law for all tenants in ancient demesne to be exempt from the payment of toll, where it is laid down by the books, not only that the freeholders in ancient demesne shall be exempt, but the copyholders also, on order, therefore, to establish the claim, if disputed, the party must prove that his land is a freehold holden of the manor by the payment of quit rent by reputation or the like, or that it is a copyhold, by shewing his admission, or that it is a leasehold of part of the demesne.

As to the nature of the tolls from which the exemption may be claimed, they appear to be tolls at fairs and markets, tolls payable by custom on passing through streets and the like. But it is perfectly clear that any toll established by a Public Act of Parliament can never be avoided by such grants as the present, for both the King and the grantees are in contemplation of law, parties to such Public Act, and have virtually consented to give up the exemption.

N. C. TINDAL,

Inner Temple,

*11th of January, 1826.*

COPY FROM THE ORIGINAL IN THE VESTRY CHEST.

PRINTED BY J. BARKER, FINCHLEY.

This is a translation into English of a Latin grant, and executory from paying of toll, with divers other privileges granted by an original Charter from King John, of famous memory. And was afterwards confirmed by Queen Elizabeth and King Charles, also of famous memories, to the several tenants of the Manor of Finchley, in the county of Middlesex :—

|   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| " The bearer hereof<br>" the said manor, and he the said<br>" servants, and so forth are entitled to the privileges, benefits and<br>" advantages granted by the same Charles, by the Grace of God, of<br>" England, Scotland, France and Ireland, King, Defender of the<br>" Faith, and so forth, to all and singular, our justices, sheriffs,<br>" escheators, mayors, coroners, headboroughs, ministers, bailiffs,<br>" constables, provisers, foresters, verdurers, stewards, regarders,<br>" and all other out officers, and ministers, and subjects whatsoever,<br>" as well within liberties as without, to whom these presents shall<br>" come greeting. WHEREAS Lord John, late King of England, our<br>" progenitor, by his Charter, bearing date at Shoreham, the Sixteenth<br>" day of June, in the first year of his reign, which Lady Elizabeth,<br>" late Queen of England, confirmed the Tenth day of February, in<br>" the second year of her reign, amongst other things, granted to God<br>" and to the Church of St. Paul, London, and to William, then<br>" Bishop thereof, and his successors, all his lands, and possessions<br>" and tenements free and clear for ever from all exactions, with all | one of the tenants of<br>" and his |
|---|------------------------------------|

" their free customs throughout our whole land, and that they and  
" their men might be free from toll and portage, and passage, and  
" payage, and lestage, and stallage, and carriage, and tallage, and  
" package, and every other custom throughout our whole land of all  
" goods which they shall carry by land or by water. And the said  
" late King forbid that nobody should trouble or vex them or their  
" goods, or possessions, or men, against the liberty of the charter  
" aforesaid, upon forfeiture of him the late King. Therefore, we  
" command you, and every of you, that you permit the men and  
" tenants of the Reverend Father in Christ, George, now Bishop of  
" London, within his demesne, or village of Finchley, in the county  
" of Middlesex, residing, to have, and exercise to them, and every of  
" them, to use and enjoy all the liberties, quittances, and privileges  
" in form aforesaid specified according to the tenor of the Charter  
" and confirmation aforesaid, not molesting, or anywise aggrieving  
" them or their men, or any of them, contrary to the tenor of the  
" same.

"In testimony whereof, we have caused these our letters to be  
"made patents. Witness our self at Westminster the Seventh day  
"of April in the third year of our reign.

“WOLSEY.”

For one of  
the tenants of the Manor of Finchley, in the County of Middlesex.

Examined and copied from the original Charter by

ROBERT JONES,  
*Vestry Clerk.*

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

22nd March, 1826.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, for the purpose of attending to the state of the poor.

Mr. ROBT. CLARIDGE in the Chair.

*Ordered* : "That George Wiggins be allowed a pair of shoes."

"And that Mrs. Watson be allowed five shillings for attending the wife of George Banks in her lying-in."

Mrs. Austin was ordered some temporary relief.

"And that Mr. Tuchbery be allowed four shillings per week."

Mrs. Hepplewhite having refused to do any work towards the support of her family, she having had several offers of good employ, it is ordered that she be taken before a magistrate and punished.

(Signed) R. CLARIDGE, *Chairman.*  
JOHN VERRALLS, *Churchwarden.*  
WM. AEDY,  
JAMES POPE, } *Overseers.*  
And four Inhabitants.

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

March 26th, 1826.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, being the monthly vestry, the following disbursements was allowed Mr. William Aedy, the East End Overseer:—

|   | Mr. Aedy's account brought forward | £  | 7  | 16 | 4 | 9 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
|---|------------------------------------|----|----|----|---|---|---------------|
| Feb. 26th—Paid allowance of vestry .. ..  | ..                                 | 0  | 5  | 6  |   |   |               |
| Gave Mrs. Burton by order of vestry .. ..   | ..                                 | 0  | 5  | 0  |   |   |               |
| Wm. Burton, by order of vestry .. ..  | ..                                 | 0  | 5  | 0  |   |   |               |
| ,, 27th—Paid for a polecat .. .. ..   | ..                                 | 0  | 0  | 8  |   |   |               |
| Burton, for sweeping poorhouse chimneys..   | ..                                 | 0  | 2  | 0  |   |   |               |
| March 6th—Paid expenses of jury on Richd. Austin ..   | ..                                 | 0  | 12 | 0  |   |   |               |
| ,, 17th—Paid for a strait waistcoat .. .. ..  | ..                                 | 1  | 1  | 0  |   |   |               |
| Sheets and other things for the poorhouse,<br>as per bill.. .. .. ..  | ..                                 | 3  | 12 | 7  |   |   |               |
| ,, 21st—Sarah Sharp's child, thirteen weeks, to<br>March 21st, 1826, at 3s. per week ..                       | ..                                 | 1  | 19 | 0  |   |   |               |
| Paid for two trusses of straw .. ..   | ..                                 | 0  | 2  | 6  |   |   |               |
| Gave Mrs. Bacholar .. .. ..   | ..                                 | 0  | 1  | 0  |   |   |               |
| Mr. Shaif, for magistrate's business..  | ..                                 | 0  | 1  | 0  |   |   |               |
| Russell, bill for bricklayer's work ..  | ..                                 | 9  | 8  | 6  |   |   |               |
| Paid for John Merril's family, fifty-two<br>weeks, up to March 25th, 1826, at 2s. 6d.<br>per week .. .. .. .. | ..                                 | 6  | 10 | 0  |   |   |               |
| Allowed do. by order of vestry .. ..  | ..                                 | 2  | 3  | 0  |   |   |               |
| And do. for the surgeon .. .. ..  | ..                                 | 1  | 0  | 0  |   |   |               |
| Do., for present relief .. .. ..  | ..                                 | 0  | 7  | 0  |   |   |               |
| March 24th—Paid for sparrows .. .. ..   | ..                                 | 0  | 0  | 4  |   |   |               |
| Paid for letters .. .. ..   | ..                                 | 0  | 2  | 1  |   |   |               |
| Relieved Elizabeth Warren .. .. ..  | ..                                 | 0  | 8  | 0  |   |   |               |
| Mrs. Baldock .. .. ..   | ..                                 | 0  | 7  | 6  |   |   |               |
| Joseph Perrett, out of employ .. .. ..  | ..                                 | 0  | 3  | 6  |   |   |               |
| Casualties .. .. ..   | ..                                 | 0  | 2  | 8  |   |   |               |
| Mrs. Austin .. .. ..  | ..                                 | 0  | 6  | 6  |   |   |               |
| Joseph Cross's family, four weeks .. ..   | ..                                 | 1  | 10 | 0  |   |   |               |
| Thos. Wattle, four weeks .. ..  | ..                                 | 0  | 16 | 0  |   |   |               |
| Hepplewhite's family, four weeks .. ..  | ..                                 | 1  | 13 | 0  |   |   |               |
| Widow Boulding, four weeks .. ..  | ..                                 | 0  | 16 | 0  |   |   |               |
| ,, 25th—Paid Jane Eastwell, two weeks .. ..   | ..                                 | 0  | 8  | 0  |   |   |               |
| Mrs. Edwards, for two weeks .. ..   | ..                                 | 0  | 14 | 0  |   |   |               |
| Relieved Elizabeth Aedy, for two weeks ..   | ..                                 | 0  | 16 | 0  |   |   |               |
| Pensioners, four weeks, to 25th of March,<br>1826 .. .. .. ..   | ..                                 | 33 | 16 | 0  |   |   |               |
|   |                                    | £  | 7  | 86 | 0 | 1 | $\frac{3}{4}$ |

Mr. James Pope, the North End Overseer, was allowed the following disbursements :

|       |  |         |    |    |
|-------|--|---------|----|----|
|       | Mr. Pope's account brought forward   | .. £485 | 6  | 1  |
|       | Relieved Darby's family, ill ..  | ..      | 1  | 4  |
|       | James Lines, ill ..  | ..      | 1  | 0  |
|       | John Perkins, ill ..   | ..      | 1  | 16 |
|       | Joseph Smith ..  | ..      | 0  | 4  |
|       | Robert Grimes's family, ill ..   | ..      | 1  | 6  |
|       | Fanny Schofield ..   | ..      | 0  | 10 |
|       | Thomas Wilden ..   | ..      | 0  | 2  |
|       | Wiggins's family, ill ..   | ..      | 2  | 0  |
|       | John Kirby, four weeks ..  | ..      | 1  | 0  |
|       | George Banks, ill ..   | ..      | 1  | 4  |
| 1826. |  |         |    |    |
| March | B. Birchmore, ill ..   | ..      | 0  | 12 |
|       | Richard Smith, ill ..  | ..      | 1  | 0  |
|       | Paid for letters ..  | ..      | 0  | 3  |
|       | Toward the funeral of Mary Ayres ..  | ..      | 1  | 0  |
|       | Paid Mrs. Watson for attending Mrs. Banks<br>in her lying-in ..  | ..      | 0  | 5  |
|       | Relieved casualties ..   | ..      | 0  | 2  |
|       | Paid for Mrs. Tovey's children, from October<br>29th, 1825, to March 25th, 1826, at 5s.<br>per week .. | ..      | 5  | 5  |
|       | Thos. Wilkinson, constables bill ..  | ..      | 5  | 3  |
|       | Paid for bed ticks for the poorhouse, as per<br>bill ..  | ..      | 3  | 18 |
|       | Pensioners, four weeks to 26th of March, 1826  | ..      | 11 | 15 |
|       |  | £525    | 0  | 7  |

Being Sacrament Sunday, it was moved by Mr. Verralls, and seconded by Mr. Lee, that this vestry be adjourned to the Queen's Head.

Mr. Lee, Churchwarden, in the Chair.

Susannah Reyner having been removed, by order, to Saint Giles, and they being dissatisfied therewith, it is ordered that Mr. Matthews should be consulted if they should appeal against such order.

Rebecca Hill, Bonnets Rents, Coopers Gardens, Bethnal Green, mother to Sarah Collins applied for a pair of shoes and a frock, the shoes was ordered and the frock denied.

(Signed)      JNO. LEE, *Chairman.*  
                   JOHN VERRALLS, *Churchwarden.*  
                   WM. AEDY, } *Overseers.*  
                   JAMES POPE, }  
                   And two Inhabitants.

## VESTRY MINUTES OF FINCHLEY.

NOTES AS TO YEAR BEGINNING EASTER  
SUNDAY, 1839.

THE minutes for the year beginning Easter, 1839, show a decline in parochial vitality, and that neglect and indifference towards Parish interests had been the beginning of the decline of Parish Vestries, brought about by the withdrawal from the inhabitants of the duty of self management of their Poor under the Poor Law Act, 1834, followed later on by the removal of Sanitary matters from the cognizance and control of the Vestries.

The population by census of 1841 was 3,610.

The inhabitants are still found meeting in the church, but the number of Vestries, which was 58 in 1833, and 56 in 1834, fell in this year to 11.

The poor rate is this year 3/6 on an assessment of £12,637 17s. 6d.

The records for this year consist mainly of resolutions to make Poor rates. The expenditure of these rates is not brought before the Vestry, nor are there traces of any co-operation between the Guardians (to whom, under the new law Poor Law, Relief was committed) and the Vestry.

The Union call is placed before the Vestry, and they have to vote the money without any means of checking or controlling the expenditure.

A paid Assistant Overseer—the first paid official under the new Poor Law—had been appointed, and through his defalcations serious losses were incurred by the Parish.

The Vestry made a rate for repair of Highways of 4d. in the £. A collector of highway rates was appointed at a salary of £10 a year.

1839—40.

MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

COPY VESTRY MINUTES FOR YEAR BEGINNING EASTER, 1839,  
AND ENDING EASTER, 1840.

*April 2nd, 1839.*

At a Vestry held in the Church on the above day, Legal notice having been given thereof, the following is the Copy:

PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

Notice is hereby given that a Vestry will be held in the Church on Tuesday the 2nd day of April, 1839, at 12 o'clock at noon, for the purpose of choosing Churchwardens and nominating Overseers of the Poor and Surveyors of the Highways for the year ensuing.

REVD. MR. WORSLEY, *Chairman.*

JAMES BLOCK, *Churchwarden.*

JNO. W. G. GOWRING, *Overseer.*

THOS. AUDSLEY, *Vestry Clerk.*

James Block, Esq., was chosen Churchwarden by the Rector.

Saml. Cullum, Esq., was chosen Churchwarden by the Inhabitants.

NOMINATED OVERSEERS.

EAST END.

Mark Plowman, 1  
William John Reeves, 6  
John Tillitt, 1

NORTH END.

Frederick Cousins, 7  
Archibald Elliot, 1  
Gervase Wheeler, 1

William Edwards and Edward Rouse were appointed Surveyors.

Evan Evans, Constable for the North End and Robert Trindall, Headborough for ditto.

Edward Irons, Constable, and John Wise, Headborough for East End.

Mr. Audsley was proposed to serve the Office of Vestry Clerk which was agreed to, at the usual salary.

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| (Signed) | RALPH WORSLEY, <i>Chairman.</i>        |
|          | SAML. HY. CULLUM, <i>Churchwarden.</i> |
|          | JNO. W. G. GOWRING, <i>Overseer.</i>   |
|          | JAMES LERMITTE, <i>Overseer.</i>       |
|          | And 5 Inhabitants.                     |

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

April 9th, 1839.

At a vestry held in the Church on the above day, Legal notice having been given thereof. The following is the copy:—

## PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

Notice is hereby given that a Vestry will be held in the Church on Tuesday the 9th day of April, 1839, for the purpose of Auditing and passing the Accounts of the Overseers for the past year, at 12 o'clock at Noon.

Signed { SAMUEL CULLUM, *Churchwarden.*  
 J. W. GOWRING, *Overseer.*  
 THOS. AUDSLEY, *Vestry Clerk.*

Mr. ROBERT CLARIDGE in the Chair.

The Accounts of the overseers being produced at this Vestry, were Audited and agreed to and allowed and passed and was ordered to be copied into this Book.

(Signed) R. CLARIDGE, *Chairman.*  
 JAMES LERMITTE,  
 JNO. W. G. GOWRING, } *Overseers.*

|          |   |      |    |   |
|----------|---|------|----|---|
| 1838     | Paid May 8th to the treasurer of the union    | £250 | 0  | 0 |
| June 2nd | —Paid county rate .. .. ..                    | 37   | 4  | 9 |
|          | Majesty's clerk for sessional business .. ..  | 0    | 19 | 0 |
| "        | Wakenell for conveying to prison .. ..        | 0    | 18 | 0 |
|          | Wm. Prince for conveying Puddyfoot to do. ..  | 0    | 10 | 6 |
|          | Morton for Elizth Page to do. .. ..           | 0    | 11 | 0 |
|          | Casual relief as pr. list .. .. ..            | 1    | 9  | 0 |
|          | Stationery 1s., Postage 6s., stamps 2s. .. .. | 0    | 9  | 0 |
|          | Empty Houses .. .. ..                         | 107  | 17 | 8 |

|                               |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Quarter ending Midsummer 1838 | .. £399 18 11 |
|-------------------------------|---------------|

|           |   |     |    |   |
|-----------|---|-----|----|---|
| August 21 | —Paid the treasurer of the union .. ..      | 328 | 0  | 0 |
| 23        | —Paid county rate .. .. ..                  | 37  | 4  | 9 |
| Sept. 14  | —One quarter's rent for old workhouse .. .. | 6   | 11 | 3 |
|           | Printing poor rate notices .. .. ..         | 0   | 7  | 6 |
|           | Poor rate books .. .. ..                    | 0   | 19 | 5 |
|           | Mr. Seacfe for sessional business .. .. ..  | 3   | 10 | 8 |
|           | Evan Evans, constables' bill .. .. ..       | 2   | 0  | 6 |
|           | Postage 5s. 9d., stamps 2s. 3d. .. .. ..    | 0   | 8  | 0 |

|                                 |             |
|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Quarter ending Michaelmas, 1838 | .. £379 2 1 |
|---------------------------------|-------------|

|      |   |              |
|------|---|--------------|
| Nov. | 17—The treasurer of the union .. ..           | .. £328 0 0  |
|      | County rate .. ..                             | .. 36 13 6   |
|      | Magistrates' clerk for sessional business ..  | .. 2 4 6     |
|      | Constables, Wm. Prince Bill ..                | .. 2 10 0    |
|      | " Caleb King do. ..                           | .. 1 16 0    |
|      | " John Fordham do. ..                         | .. 3 4 6     |
|      | Conveying } John Smith Bill ..                | .. 0 7 7½    |
|      | persons to prison, } Joseph Higgs do. ..      | .. 2 14 0    |
|      | by order of } Willm. Davis do. ..             | .. 2 8 0     |
|      | the Magistrates. } William Davis do. ..       | .. 0 8 0     |
|      | Mr. Audsles for removals .. ..                | .. 0 17 0    |
|      | Casual relief and removals .. ..              | .. 1 13 1    |
|      | Letters 5s., Carriage 10s., Stamps 2s. 6d. .. | .. 0 17 6    |
|      | Quarter ending Christmas 1838 ..              | .. £383 4 8½ |

1839.

|        |   |               |
|--------|---|---------------|
| Febry. | 9—The treasurer of the union .. ..                | .. £272 0 0   |
|        | County rate 17 Jan. 1839 ..                       | .. 61 2 6     |
|        | Magistrates' clerk as pr. bill ..                 | .. 2 3 9      |
|        | Constable Phillip Alpress' bill ..                | .. 1 15 9     |
|        | John Freeman .. ..                                | .. 0 2 6      |
|        | Casual relief as pr. list .. ..                   | .. 2 9 11½    |
|        | Letters 7s. 7d., Stamp 6d., Rate books 5s. 5d. .. | .. 0 13 6     |
|        | Quarter ending Lady-day, 1839 ..                  | .. £340 7 11½ |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Assistant overseer and collector, one year to<br>Lady-day, 1839 .. .. | .. £80 0 0 |
| £ s. d.   |            |
| 399 18 11   |            |
| 379 2 1   |            |
| 383 4 8½  |            |
| 340 7 11½   |            |
| 1,502 13 8  |            |
| 80 0 0  |            |
| 1,582 13 8  |            |

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

April 12th, 1839.

At a vestry held in the church on the above day, legal notice having been given thereof. The following is the Copy:—

## PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

Notice is hereby given that a vestry will be held in the church on Friday the 12th of April, 1839, at one o'clock in the afternoon, for

the purpose of auditing and passing the accounts of the surveyors of the highways for the past year.

EDWARD ROUSE,  
WILLIAM EDWARDS, } *Surveyors.*

JOHN CALEB SIMMONDS in the Chair.

The surveyors' accounts, Mr. Rouse and Mr. Edwards, were produced to this vestry and audited, agreed to, allowed and passed, and ordered to be entered in a book kept for that purpose.

(Signed) J. C. SIMMONDS, *Chairman.*

SAML. HY. CULLUM, *Churchwarden.*

And 3 Inhabitants.

MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*April 25th, 1839.*

A vestry was held in the church, on the above day and date, legal notice having been given thereof. The following is the Copy :—

PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

Notice is hereby given that a vestry will be held in the church on Thursday the 25th of April, 1839, at four o'clock in the afternoon for the purpose of auditing and passing the accounts of the churchwardens for the past year.

(Signed) JAMES BLOCK  
SAML. CULLUM } *Churchwardens.*

THOS. AUDSLEY, *Vestry Clerk.*

Mr. R. CLARIDGE in the Chair.

The churchwardens accounts were produced at this vestry and were audited, examined, agreed to and allowed, and passed, and the accounts were ordered to be entered in this book.

R. CLARIDGE, *Chairman.*

| Dr.   | £  | s.  | d. | Cr.                                     | £                       | s. | d. |   |
|---|----|-----|----|---|-------------------------|----|----|---|
| Amount of East end<br>rate made 13th of<br>Sept., 1838..        | .. | 114 | 15 | 8                                       | Balance to collector .. | 21 | 0  | 5 |
| North end do..  | .. | 88  | 16 | 10                                      | Church clerk..          | .. | 30 | 0 |
| Received of defaulters<br>to rate made 15th of<br>Sept. 1836 .. | .. | 5   | 0  | Sexton ..                               | ..                      | 20 | 0  |   |
| For burials of non-<br>parishioners ..                          | .. | 7   | 7  | Vestry clerk (old debt)<br>do. for duty | 20                      | 0  | 0  |   |
|   |    |     |    | Tradesmen's bills ..                    | 20                      | 0  | 4  |   |
|   |    |     |    | Incidentals ..                          | ..                      | 12 | 19 |   |
|   |    |     |    | Balance uncollected..                   | 81                      | 19 | 3  |   |
|   |    |     |    |   | £215                    | 19 | 10 |   |

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*July 11th, 1839.*

A vestry was held in the church on the above day legal, notice having been given of the same. The following is the Copy of such notice:—

## PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

Notice is hereby given notice that a vestry will be held in the church on Thursday next, July 11th, 1839, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon for the purpose of making a rate for the relief of the poor, and other allowable disbursements.

WILLIAM J. REEVE, *Overseer.*JOHN TATUM, *A.O.**July 7th, 1839.*

Mr. WILLIAM JOHN REEVE in the chair.

Ordered and agreed to that a rate of tenpence in the pound be made for the above written purpose, and the same is made accordingly.

(Signed) WILLIAM J. REEVE, in the Chair.

WM. FANNING.

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*August 1st, 1839.*

A vestry was held in the vestry room of the above Parish Church on the above day and date, legal notice having been given of the same. The following is the Copy:—

## PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

Notice is hereby given that a vestry meeting will be holden in the vestry room of the church of the said parish on Thursday next at four o'clock in the afternoon for the purpose of considering the propriety of taking proceedings to recover the church rates due by the defaulters, and determining what measures shall be adopted respecting the same: and other special matters relating thereto.

By order of the Churchwardens,

JAMES BLOCK,  
SAM'L. HY. CULLUM. } *Churchwardens.*

JAMES BLOCK in the Chair.

After much discussion—

Mr. Howell proposed that copies of the expenditure of the church rates in the possession of the churchwardens be sent to Mr. Howell for which copy Mr. Jaques will pay.

Seconded by Mr. Jaques.

Carried by a show of hands.

Mr. Gowring proposed that the granting the above proposition of Mr. Howell should not be quoted as a precedent for any future vestry.

Seconded by Mr. Wheeler.

Carried unanimously.

(Signed) JAMES BLOCK, *Chairman,* }  
SAML. HY. CULLUM, } *Churchwardens.*  
And 18 Inhabitants.

---

MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*October the 10th, 1839.*

A vestry was held in the above Parish Church on the above written day, legal notice having been given thereof. The following is the Copy:—

PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

Notice is hereby given that a vestry will be held in the Parish Church on Thursday the 10th day of October, 1839, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of making a rate for the relief of the poor, and other allowable disbursements.

FREDERICK COUSINS, }  
WILLIAM J. REEVES, } *Overseers.*

WILLIAM J. REEVE in the Chair.

Ordered and agreed that a rate of tenpence in the pound for the above purpose be made, and the same is made accordingly.

(Signed) W. J. REEVE, *Chairman.*  
FREDK. COUSINS, *Overseer.*  
and 5 inhabitants.

---

MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*December 12th, 1839.*

A vestry was held in the church on the above day and date, legal notice having been given thereof. The following is the Copy:—

PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

Notice is hereby given that a vestry will be held in the church on Thursday next at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of going through the accounts of the assistant overseer, John Tatum.

FRED. COUSINS, }  
Wm. J. REEVES, } *Overseers.*

*December the 8th, 1839.*

JAMES BLOCK, Esqre., in the chair.

This vestry was adjourned to the Queen's Head.

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

Jany. 4th, 1840.

A vestry was held in the above Parish Church on the above written day, legal notice having been given thereof. The following is the Copy :—

## PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

Notice is hereby given, that a vestry will be held in the church on Saturday next, the 4th day of January, 1840, for the purpose of making a church rate, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

JAMES BLOCK,  
S. Hy. CULLUM, } *Churchwardens.*

Decr. 29th, 1839.

JAMES BLOCK, Esqre., in the chair.

Proposed by Mr. Butler, and seconded by Mr. Wand, that a rate of two pence in the pound be made, which was carried by shew of hands and agreed to, and allowed the said rate to be made upon the last poor rate assessment.

JAMES BLOCK, *Chairman.*  
SAML. HY. CULLUM, *Churchwarden.*  
E. R. BUTLER.  
R. CLARIDGE.  
EDMUND AEDY.  
EDD. WAND.

|                      | £              | s.        | d.       |         | £           | s.        | d.       |
|----------------------|----------------|-----------|----------|---------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| Rental, east end ..  | 7,085          | 16        | 6        | Rate .. | ..          | 59        | 5 11     |
| Rental, north end .. | 5,552          | 1         | 0        | Rate .. | ..          | 46        | 4 10     |
|                      | <u>£12,637</u> | <u>17</u> | <u>6</u> |         | <u>£105</u> | <u>10</u> | <u>9</u> |

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

February 6th, 1840.

A vestry was held in the above Parish Church on the day and date above written, legal notice being given thereof. The following is the Copy of such notice :—

## PARISH OF FINCHLEY, 1st February, 1840.

Notice is hereby given that a vestry meeting will be held in the Parish Church on Thursday next, at two o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of making a rate for the relief of the poor, and other necessary expenditure.

J. W. REEVE,  
FREDK. COUSINS, } *Overseers.*

JAMES BLOCK, Esqr., *Chairman.*

Ordered that a rate of      in the pound be made for the above purposes, and the same is made according.

This vestry was adjourned till Thursday next, at five o'clock in the evening, of which legal notice will be given.

JAMES BLOCK, *Chairman.*

MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*February 13th, 1840.*

A vestry was held in the above Parish Church on the above day and date, legal notice being given thereof. The following is the Copy :—

PARISH OF FINCHLEY, 9th February, 1840.

Notice is hereby given, that a vestry meeting will be held in the Parish Church on Thursday next, at five o'clock in the evening, for the purpose of making a rate for the relief of the poor and other necessary expenditure, and to go through the accounts of the assistant overseer.

W. J. REEVE,  
FREDK. COUSINS, } *Overseers.*

JAMES BLOCK, Esqre., in the Chair.

Ordered and agreed, that a rate of one shilling and eightpence in the pound be made for the above purpose, and the same is made accordingly.

(Signed)      JAMES BLOCK, *Chairman.*

SAM. HY. CULLUM, *Churchwarden.*

WILLIAM J. REEVE  
FREDK. COUSINS } *Overseers.*

And 8 Inhabitants.

This vestry resolves that Mr. Tattam discontinue to collect the rates for the present and that the overseers, Messrs. W. J. Reeve and Fredk. Cousins, do collect the arrears of former rates and the rate made this day.

(Signed)      JOHN BLOCK, *Chairman.*

MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*April 2nd, 1840.*

A vestry was held in the above Parish Church on the day and date above written pursuant to notice given for that purpose. The following is the Copy of such notice :—

## PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

Notice is hereby given that a vestry will be held in the church on Thursday the second day of April, 1840, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon for the purpose of nominating overseers of the poor for the year ensuing, and likewise to appoint surveyors of the highways for the ensuing year.

J. W. J. REEVE,  
FREDK. COUSINS, } Overseers.

*March*, 1840.

JAMES BLOCK, Esqre., in the Chair.

The following persons were nominated to serve the office of overseers:—

| EAST END.        | NORTH END.          |
|------------------|---------------------|
| Mark Plowman, 15 | Charles Jaques, 16  |
| Edwd. Wand, 4    | George Hays, 6      |
| John Tilley, 3   | Hanson Stuchbery, 0 |

William Edwards and John Caleb Simmonds were appointed surveyors of the highways for the year ensuing.

(Signed)      JAMES BLOCK, *Chairman.*  
And 8 Inhabitants.

## MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHLEY.

*April 9th, 1840.*

A vestry was held in the above Parish Church on the day and date above written, legal notice having been given thereof. The following is the Copy of such notice:—

## PARISH OF FINCHLEY, COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX.

Notice is hereby given, that a vestry will be held in the church on Thursday April ninth, 1840, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, for the purpose of auditing and passing the accounts of the late overseers.

W. J. REEVE,  
FREDK. COUSINS, } Overseers.

*April 5th, 1840.*

The vestry having received from the overseers a report of their account for the year ending lady day last, the unsatisfactory state of which this vestry considers entirely owing to the acknowledged misapplication of funds received by John Tattam, late assistant overseer, on the parish account.

They, the overseers, are hereby recommended to proceed immediately to a final adjustment thereof, and with a view to a speedy

settlement, they are further recommended to hold private and immediate communications with their successors.

John Tattum having distinctly and repeatedly acknowledged the misapplication before stated, it is hereby resolved that he has ceased to be assistant overseer.

It is the opinion of this vestry that the said John Tattum having distinctly acknowledged that he is guilty of misapplication of rates received by him for the parish account, this vestry hereby requires the overseers to proceed with such acknowledged defaulter as directed by the Poor Law Amendment Act, sec. 101.

It is resolved that with reference to the preservation of the parish accounts, neglect has been allowed to creep on, and that with a view to the removal of evil consequences, a duplicate of each rate book be made by the vestry clerk, and retained by him for the purpose of reference, and that at the end of each succeeding parish year the books and accounts be deposited in the vestry.

(Signed)      JAMES BLOCK, *Chairman*  
                   W. REEVE,  
                   SAMUEL HY.CULLUM, } *Churchwardens.*  
                   And 12 Inhabitants.  
                   C. JAQUES,  
                   MARK PLOWMAN, } *Overseers.*  
                   J. C. SIMMONDS, *Guardian.*

---

MIDDLESEX, PARISH OF FINCHILEY.

*April 10th, 1840.*

A vestry was held in the above parish on the above day, legal notice having been given thereof, for the purpose of auditing and passing the accounts of the surveyors of the highways for the past year.

MR. JOHN SPENCER in the Chair.

Proposed by Mr. Spence, Chairman, and seconded by Mr. Rouse and carried unanimously, that a collector be appointed to collect the highways rate (at a salary of ten pounds per annum), pursuant to the 36th clause of the 5th and 6th of William the 4th, chap. 50.

Ordered that a rate of fourpence in the pound be allowed for the purpose of the repairs of the parish roads, and other necessary expenses.

The accounts of the surveyors of the highways was produced to this vestry, and was audited and agreed to and allowed and passed.

Resolved that this vestry do recommend to the Justices in Petty Sessions to sanction the allowance of 1s. 3d. per yard per mile to the respective owners of teams for the conveyance of road material in the East district of this parish.

(Signed)      J. W. SPENCER, *Chairman.*  
                   C. JAQUES, *Overseer.*  
                   And 4 Inhabitants.

## PARISH OF FINCHLEY, COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX.

April 16th, 1840.

A vestry was held in the above Parish Church on the above day and date, legal notice having been given thereof, for the purpose of auditing and passing the accounts of the overseers of the poor for the past year.

The overseers having presented an account, the best they are in a condition to render under existing circumstances, and which accounts the chairman is desired to attest on behalf of the vestry.

Resolved, as proposed by Mr. Wimbush, and seconded by Mr. Gowring, that the said accounts be passed.

(Signed) JAMES BLOCK, *Chairman.*W. G. REEVE,  
FREDK. COUSINS, } *Late Overseers.*

And six Inhabitants.

Copy of the above written accounts.

Dr.

|  |    |    | £             | s. | d.  |
|--|----|----|---------------|----|-----|
| Balance from previous quarter ..           | .. | .. | 322           | 16 | 5   |
| Amount of rate made February 13th, 1840 .. | .. | .. | 1,014         | 6  | 11½ |
|  |    |    | <u>£1,344</u> | 3  | 4½  |

Cr.

## DISBURSEMENTS:—

|                                  |    |    | £           | s. | d. |
|----------------------------------|----|----|-------------|----|----|
| Lunatic Asylum ..                | .. | .. | 42          | 2  | 11 |
| Treasurer of the Union ..        | .. | .. | 221         | 0  | 0  |
| County rate ..                   | .. | .. | 49          | 8  | 8  |
| Police rate ..                   | .. | .. | 148         | 6  | 0  |
| Treasurer of the Union ..        | .. | .. | 177         | 0  | 0  |
| Mr. Baldock for printing ..      | .. | .. | 0           | 9  | 0  |
| Mr. Corrie ..                    | .. | .. | 4           | 14 | 6  |
| Lloyd, for rent poor land ..     | .. | .. | 16          | 0  | 0  |
| Stamps ..                        | .. | .. | 1           | 1  | 0  |
| Skaife for sessional business .. | .. | .. | 3           | 3  | 0  |
| Skaife for summonses ..          | .. | .. | 2           | 7  | 0  |
| Frost constables' duty ..        | .. | .. | 1           | 9  | 6  |
| Receipt books ..                 | .. | .. | 0           | 2  | 6  |
| Mr. Franklyn, act of Barnet ..   | .. | .. | 2           | 18 | 0  |
| Police constables ..             | .. | .. | 1           | 4  | 0  |
| Passes and casual relief ..      | .. | .. | 0           | 6  | 6  |
| Carried forward ..               | .. | .. | <u>£671</u> | 12 | 7  |

|   |        |    |    |
|---|--------|----|----|
| Brought forward   | £671   | 12 | 7  |
| Stationery and postage .. ..  | 1      | 4  | 8  |
| Empty houses and errors .. ..   | 49     | 1  | 11 |
| Uncollected and summoned rates ..   | 136    | 15 | 8½ |
| Mr. Tattam, the assistant overseer and<br>collector, defalcations, part of which are<br>unaccounted for and uncollected rates | 310    | 3  | 8  |
|   | £1,168 | 18 | 6  |
| Collected of October rate .. ..   | 19     | 12 | 9  |
| Balance of February rate .. ..  | 155    | 12 | 1  |
| Balance in hand .. ..   | 175    | 4  | 10 |
|   | £1,344 | 3  | 4½ |

VESTRY ROOM, FINCHLEY,

April 16th, 1840.

(Signed) JAMES BLOCK, *Chairman.*FREDK. COUSINS, } *Late Overseers.*  
W. J. REEVE,







UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below

MAY 20 1946

Form L-9  
20m-1, '41(1122)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

AT

LOS ANGELES  
LIBRARY

JS

261 Stephens -

S83p Parochial

self-

government in rural  
districts.

*[Handwritten]*

MAY 20 1945

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 516 060 1

JS

261

S83p

